arXiv:1412.4496v2 [math.AC] 22 Sep 2015

DISCRETE POLYMATROIDS SATISFYING A STRONGER SYMMETRIC EXCHANGE PROPERTY

DANCHENG LU

Abstract. In this paper we introduce discrete polymatroids satisfying the one-sided strong exchange property and show that they are sortable (as a consequence their base rings are Koszul) and that they satisfy White's conjecture. Since any pruned lattice path polymatroid satisfies the one-sided strong exchange property, this result provides an alternative proof for one of the main theorems of J. Schweig in [10], where it is shown that every pruned lattice path polymatroid satisfies White's conjecture. In addition we characterize a class of such polymatroids whose base rings are Gorenstein. Finally for two classes of pruned lattice path polymatroidal ideals I and their powers we determine their depth and their associated prime ideals, and furthermore determine the least power k for which $\operatorname{depth} S/I^k$ and $\operatorname{Ass}(S/I^k)$ stabilize. It turns out that $\operatorname{depth} S/I^k$ stabilizes if and only if $\operatorname{Ass}(S/I^k)$ stabilizes.

Introduction

Throughout this paper, we always denote vectors by boldface such as $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ etc. If $\mathbf{u}$ is a vector in $\mathbb{Z}^n$, we use either u_i or $\mathbf{u}(i)$ to denote its ith entry and use $\mathbf{u}(A)$ to denote the number $\sum_{i\in A} u_i$ for any subset $A \subseteq \{1,\dots,n\}$. Let k, ℓ be integers with $k \leq \ell$. Then $[k,\ell]$ denotes the interval $\{k, k+1, \dots, \ell\}$ and $[1,k]$ is usually denoted by $[k]$ for short. Also we denote by $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_n$ the canonical basis of $\mathbb{Z}^n$ and by $\mathbb{Z}_+$ the set of non-negative integer. Unless otherwise stated, S always denotes the polynomial ring $K[x_1,\dots,x_n]$ over a field K, and for $A \subseteq [n]$, P_A denotes the monomial prime ideal $(x_i\colon\ i \in A)$ of S.

For the basic knowledge of matroid we refer to [9]. In [4], discrete polymatroids was introduced, which generalize matroids in the way that monomial ideals generalize squarefree monomial ideals.

A *discrete polymatroid* on the ground set $[n]$ is a nonempty finite set $\mathbf{P} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ satisfying

(D1) if $\mathbf{u} = (u_1,\dots,u_n) \in \mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{v} = (v_1,\dots,v_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ with $\mathbf{v} \leq \mathbf{u}$, then $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{P}$; Here $\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{v}$ means that $u_i \leq v_i$ for $i = 1,\dots,n$.

(D2) if $\mathbf{u} = (u_1,\dots,u_n) \in \mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{v} = (v_1,\dots,v_n) \in \mathbf{P}$ with $|\mathbf{u}| < |\mathbf{v}|$, then there is $i \in [n]$ with $u_i < v_i$ such that $\mathbf{u} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \in \mathbf{P}$. Here $|\mathbf{u}| = \mathbf{u}([n])$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13D02, 13C13; Secondary 05E40.

Key words and phrases. White's conjecture, Gorenstein, Pruned lattice path polymatroid, Linear quotient, Depth.

The paper was written while the author was visiting the Department of Mathematics of University Duisburg-Essen. He wants to express his thanks for its hospitality.

A *base* of a discrete polymatroid $\mathbf{P}$ is a vector $\mathbf{u}$ of $\mathbf{P}$ such that $\mathbf{u} < \mathbf{v}$ for no $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{P}$. Every base of $\mathbf{P}$ has the same modulus $\mathrm{rank}(\mathbf{P})$, the *rank* of $\mathbf{P}$. Let $B(\mathbf{P})$ or simply B denote the set of bases of $\mathbf{P}$. Every discrete polymatroid satisfies the following symmetric exchange property: if $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ are vectors of B, then for any $i \in [n]$ with $u_i < v_i$, there is $j \in [n]$ with $u_j > v_j$ such that both $\mathbf{u} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$ and $\mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$ belong to B. Conversely if B is a set of vectors in $\mathbb{Z}_+^n$ of same modulus satisfying the symmetric exchange property, then $\mathbf{P} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n : \ \mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{v} \text{ for some } \mathbf{v} \in B\}$ is a discrete polymatroid with B as its set of bases.

We are interested in two algebraic structures associated with a discrete polymatroid $\mathbf{P}$: its *base ring* and its *polymatroidal ideal*. Let K be a field. The base ring $K[B(\mathbf{P})]$ (or simply $K[B]$) of $\mathbf{P}$ is defined to be the subring of $K[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ generated by monomials $\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{u}} = t_1^{u_1} \ldots t_n^{u_n}$ with $\mathbf{u} \in B$. Meanwhile the polymatroidal ideal of $\mathbf{P}$ is defined to be the monomial ideal in $S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ generated by $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} = x_1^{u_1} \ldots x_n^{u_n}$ with $\mathbf{u} \in B$.

Let T be the polynomial ring $K[x_{\mathbf{u}} : \mathbf{u} \in B]$ and let I_B be the kernel of the K-algebra homomorphism $\phi : T \to K[B]$ with $\phi(x_{\mathbf{u}}) = \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{u}}$ for any $\mathbf{u} \in B$. There are some obvious generators in I_B. Indeed, let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in B$ with $u_i > v_i$. Then there exists j such that $u_j < v_j$ and such that $\mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$ and $\mathbf{v} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$ belong to B. We see that $x_{\mathbf{u}} x_{\mathbf{v}} - x_{\mathbf{u}-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i+\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j} x_{\mathbf{v}+\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j} \in I_B$. Such relations are called *symmetric exchange relations.* White [13] conjectured that for a matroid the symmetric exchange relations generate I_B. It is natural to conjecture that this also holds for discrete polymatroids.

Conjecture (White)**.** *Let* $\mathbf{P}$ *be a discrete polymatroid on the ground set* $[n]$ *with* B *as its set of bases. Then* I_B *is generated by symmetric exchange relations.*

In [4] it was shown that if White's conjecture holds for all matroids, then it holds for all discrete polymatroids as well, and that any discrete polymatroid satisfying the strong symmetric exchange property satisfies White's conjecture. Recall that a discrete polymatroid $\mathbf{P}$ is said to have the *strong symmetric exchange property* if for any bases $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ of $\mathbf{P}$ with $u_i < v_i$ and $u_j > v_j$, both $\mathbf{u} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$ and $\mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$ are bases of $\mathbf{P}$.

In [10] J. Schweig introduced pruned lattice path polymatroids and proved that they satisfy White's conjecture. He actually proved that the symmetric exchange relations form a Gröbner basis of I_B for such discrete polymatroids.

In Section 1 we introduce discrete polymatroids satisfying the one-sided strong symmetric exchange property (see Definition 1.1) and show that they are sortable and that they satisfy White's conjecture. It is known by [4, Lemma 5.2] that the sorting relations form a Gröbner basis of the defining ideal I_B in this case. As a consequence, the base ring of a discrete polymatroid satisfying the one-sided strong symmetric exchange property is Koszul.

A pruned lattice path polymatroid may be described in terms of inequalities of the set of its bases as follows:

Definition. Let n, d be positive integers and given vectors $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n), \mathbf{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_n), \boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n), \boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n)$ in $\mathbb{Z}_+^n$ such that $\alpha_1 \leq \cdots \leq \alpha_n = d$, $\beta_1 \leq \cdots \leq \beta_n = d$ and $\alpha_i \leq \beta_i$. A discrete polymatroid $\mathbf{P}$ on the ground set $[n]$ is called a *pruned lattice path polymatroid* or simply a *PLP-polymatroid* (of type $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$), if the set B of its bases consists of vectors $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ such that

$$a_i \leq u_i \leq b_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n,$$

and

$$\alpha_i \leq u_1 + u_2 + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n.$$

If $a_i = 0$ and $b_i = d$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, then the first n inequalities can be dropped in this definition. In this case, $\mathbf{P}$ is a *lattice path polymatroid*, or a *LP-polymatroid* for short.

Taking advantage of this definition we prove in Section 2 that a PLP-polymatroid satisfies the two-sided strong symmetric exchange property and thus satisfies White's Conjecture. We find an example of discrete polymatroid satisfying the two-sided strong symmetric exchange property which is not a PLP-polymatroid. However this example is isomorphic to a PLP-polymatroid. On the other hand, we show for some special discrete polymatroids that the one-sided strong exchange property implies the property of being a PLP-polymatroid. The precise relationship between polymatroids satisfying the two-sided strong symmetric exchange property and pruned lattice path polymatroid remains to be revealed.

We have known that the base ring $K[B(\mathcal{P})]$ of every discrete polymatroid $\mathcal{P}$ is always normal, see e.g. [5, Theorem 12.5.1] and thus Cohen-Macaulay. It is then natural to ask when those rings are Gorenstein. However it seems quite difficult to obtain a perfect answer to this problem. In [1], the Gorenstein algebra of Veronese type was classified. Note that the algebra of Veronese type is the base ring of a PLP-polymatroid of type $(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{b}|\mathbf{0}, d(1, \ldots, 1))$ for some $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ and $0 < d \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. In [4], generic discrete polymatroids were introduced and such discrete polymatroids whose base rings are Gorenstein were characterized. In Section 3, we will give a characterization of a special class of PLP-polymatroids which have Gorenstein base rings.

From Section 4 on, we will turn to investigate the algebraic properties of polymatroidal ideals for some certain PLP-polymatroids.

In Section 4, we deduce a formula to compute the depth for a PLP-polymatroidal ideal, see (6). This formula plays a key role in the last two sections. As an immediate application, we determine in Proposition 4.7 the associated prime ideals of a LP-polymatroidal ideal. This result is repeatedly used in what follows.

In the remaining two sections we consider special classes of PLP-polymatroidal ideals where the questions concerning depth and associated prime ideals of powers of ideals have complete answers.

The ideals considered in Section 5 are called left PLP-polymatroidal ideals. We say that a PLP-polymatroidal ideal of type $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is a *left PLP-polymatroidal*

ideal, if there exists $k \in [1, n-1]$ such that $a_i = 0$, $b_i \geq d$ for all $k+1 \leq i \leq n$ and $\alpha_i = 0$, $\beta_i = \beta_{k+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. We first show in Proposition 5.2 that $\operatorname{depth} S/I = |\{k+1 \leq i \leq n-1 \colon \alpha_i = \beta_i\}|$, and thus the depth function $\operatorname{depth} S/I^k$ stabilizes from the very beginning.

The main tool to determine the associated prime ideals of our ideals is localization. By using this technique it suffices to characterize when a suitable localization of the ideal is of depth zero. This can be checked with formula (6). Given a subset A of $[1, n]$, let P_A denote the prime ideal $(x_i \colon i \in A)$. It turns out, see Corollary 5.5, that $P_A \in \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$ only if A is an interval contained in $[k+2, n]$ or $A = B \cup [k+1, n]$ for some subset B of $[1, k]$ with k as in the definition of left PLP-polymatroidal ideals. In Theorem 5.8 the precise set of associated prime ideals is determined. As a consequence we obtain in Corollary 5.9 that all powers of a left PLP-polymatroidal ideal have the same set of associated prime ideals.

In Section 6, we consider *right PLP-polymatroidal ideals.* A PLP-polymatroidal ideal of type $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is called a right PLP-polymatroidal ideal, if there exists $k \in [1, n-1]$ such that $a_i = 0$ and $b_i \geq d$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, and $\alpha_i = \alpha_k$ and $\beta_i = d$ for all $k+1 \leq i \leq n-1$. To determine the depth and the associated prime ideals for this class of ideals is more complicated than in the case of left one. For example, if I is a right PLP-polymatroidal ideal then $\operatorname{Ass}(S/I^k)$ is not stable from the very beginning. The precise power when this happens is given in Theorem 6.11. In Proposition 6.9 the set $\operatorname{Ass}^\infty(S/I)$, which describes the set of associated prime ideals of all large powers of I, is determined. A formula for the depth of I is given in Theorem 6.4 and the powers for which the depth stabilizes is given in Corollary 6.5.

As observed in [8], every polymatroidal ideal is of strong intersection type, that is, it is the intersection of some powers of its associated prime ideals. Thus we can use the results obtained in Section 5 and Section 6 to provide an irredundant primary decomposition for any left or right PLP-polymatroidal ideal.

Since the left and right pruned lattice path polymatroidal ideals have shown such a different algebraic behaviour it is not expected that there is a nice and uniform description of the depth and the set of associated prime ideals for arbitrary PLP-polyatroidal ideals.

1. The one-sided strong symmetric exchange property and the conjecture of White

In this section we introduce the concept of the one-sided strong symmetric exchange property for discrete polymatroids and show that such discrete polymatroids are sortable and satisfy White's conjecture.

Definition 1.1. Let $\mathbf{P}$ be a discrete polymatroid on the ground set $[n]$ with B as its set of bases. Then we say that B (or $\mathbf{P}$) satisfies the *left-sided strong symmetric exchange property*, if for any pair $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in B$ such that $\mathbf{u}(i) > \mathbf{v}(i)$ and $\mathbf{u}(1) + \cdots + \mathbf{u}(i-1) < \mathbf{v}(1) + \cdots + \mathbf{v}(i-1)$, there exists $j \leq i-1$ such that $\mathbf{u}(j) < \mathbf{v}(j)$ and both $\mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$ and $\mathbf{v} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$ belong to B. Here $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$ denotes the ith canonical basis vector of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Similarly, the right-sided strong symmetric exchange property is defined. If B or $\mathbf{P}$ satisfies both the left-sided and right-sided strong symmetric exchange property, we say that B or $\mathbf{P}$ satisfies the two-sided strong symmetric exchange property. Recall that a discrete polymatroid $\mathbf{P}$ is said to have the *strong symmetric exchange property* if for any bases $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ of $\mathbf{P}$ with $u_i < v_i$ and $u_j > v_j$, both $\mathbf{u} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$ and $\mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$ are bases of $\mathbf{P}$. Hence the two-sided strong symmetric exchange property does not imply the strong symmetric exchange property

We also say that a monomial ideal I satisfies the left-, right- or two-sided strong symmetric exchange property, if it is the polymatroidal ideal of a discrete polymatroid which has this property.

In the following theorem we will show if B satisfies one-sided (left-sided or right-sided) strong symmetric exchange property, then B is sortable and I_B is generated by symmetric exchange relations.

For the proof of this result we need some preparations. First we recall the notion of sortability, which was introduced by Sturmfels [12].

Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in B$, and write $\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{v}} = t_{i_1}t_{i_1} \dots t_{i_{2d}}$ with $i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_{2d}$. Here d is the rank of $\mathbf{P}$. Then we set $\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{u}'} = t_{i_1}t_{i_3} \dots t_{i_{(2d-1)}}$ and $\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{v}'} = t_{i_2}t_{i_4} \dots t_{i_{(2d)}}$. This defines a map:

$$\text{sort} : B \times B \to M_d \times M_d, \qquad (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \to (\mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}'),$$

where M_d denotes all vectors $\mathbf{u}$ in $\mathbb{Z}_+^n$ with $|\mathbf{u}| = d$.

The map "sort" is called a *sorting operator*. A pair $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ is called *sorted* if $\text{sort}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ and B is called *sortable* if for all pair $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in B \times B$, one has $\text{sort}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in B \times B$. We see that if $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ is sorted, then $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}$ is a vector with entries ± 1 and 0.

Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$ be elements in B with $|\mathbf{u}(i) - \mathbf{v}(i)| \leq 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. As in [4, Page 253] one associates $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ with a sequence $s(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ of signs $+$ and $-$ depending on $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}$: reading $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}$ from the left to right we put the sign $+$ or the sign $-$ if we reach the entry $+1$ or the entry -1. For example, if $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} = (0, 0, -1, 0, 1, 1, -1, 0)$, then $s(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = -, +, +, -$. Note that the sequence $s(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ always contains as many $+$ as $-$ signs, since $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{u}(i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{v}(i)$ and $|\mathbf{u}(i) - \mathbf{v}(i)| \leq 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. By [4, Lemma 5.1], a pair $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ is sorted if and only if $s(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ is a sequence of alternating signs: $+, -, +, -, \cdots$.

We observe the following fact: if $\mathbf{u}(i) - \mathbf{v}(i) = 1$ and $\mathbf{u}(j) - \mathbf{v}(j) = -1$, then $s(\mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j, \mathbf{v} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j)$ is obtained from $s(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ by exchanging corresponding signs. For instance for $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ with $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}$ as before, we get $s(\mathbf{u} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_3 - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_5, \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_3 + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_5) = +, -, +-$ which is obtained from $s(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ by exchanging the first and second sign in the sequence.

Finally, if $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in B$ and $\text{sort}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = (\mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}')$, then $x_{\mathbf{u}}x_{\mathbf{v}} - x_{\mathbf{u}'}x_{\mathbf{v}'}$ is called a *sorting relation*. Note that if $(\mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}') \notin B \times B$, then the sorting relation $x_{\mathbf{u}}x_{\mathbf{v}} - x_{\mathbf{u}'}x_{\mathbf{v}'}$ does not belong to I_B. In view of [4, Lemma 5.2], we see that if B is sortable then I_B has a Gröbner base consisting of the sorting relations: $x_{\mathbf{u}}x_{\mathbf{v}} - x_{\mathbf{u}'}x_{\mathbf{v}'}$, where $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ ranges over $B \times B$.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that B satisfies the one-sided (left-sided or right-sided) strong symmetric exchange property. Then:*
(a) *B is sortable and sorting relations form a Gröbner base of I_B;*
(b) *I_B is generated by symmetric exchange relations.*

Proof. (a) Without loss of generality we assume that B satisfies right-sided strong symmetric exchange property. We denote by E_B the ideal (contained in I_B) which is generated by the symmetric exchange relations.

Let $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in B \times B$. By [4, Lemma 5.4] there exists $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1) \in B \times B$ such that $x_{\mathbf{u}}x_{\mathbf{v}} - x_{\mathbf{u}_1}x_{\mathbf{v}_1} \in E_B$ and $|\mathbf{u}_1(i) - \mathbf{v}_1(i)| \leq 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. We claim that there exists $(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_2) \in B \times B$ such that $x_{\mathbf{u}_1}x_{\mathbf{v}_1} - x_{\mathbf{u}_2}x_{\mathbf{v}_2} \in E_B$ and $(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_2)$ is sorted.

The sign at position i of the sequence $s(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1)$ will be denoted by $s_i(\mathbf{u_1}, \mathbf{v_1})$. Without loss of generality we may suppose that $s_1(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1) = +$. Let $i \geq 2$ be the smallest integer with the property that $s_{i-1}(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1) = s_i(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1)$. For convenience, we denote this number i by $c(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1)$ and set $c(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1) = \infty$ if no such i exists. We observe that $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1)$ is sorted if and only if $c(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1) = \infty$ and that if $c(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1) < \infty$, then $c(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1) < n$.

There are several cases to consider.

If $c(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1) = \infty$, there is nothing to prove.

Assume that $c(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1) < \infty$. Then we let $i = c(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1)$ and suppose first that $s_i(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1) = +$. By definition, $s_i(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1)$ corresponds to the sign of say the i_1-th entry of $\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{v}_1$ for some $i_1 \geq i$. Note that our assumptions imply that $\mathbf{u}_1(i_1) - \mathbf{v}_1(i_1) = 1$ and $\mathbf{u}_1(i_1 + 1) + \cdots + \mathbf{u}(n) < \mathbf{v}_1(i_1 + 1) + \cdots + \mathbf{v}(n)$. Therefore, since B satisfies the right-sided strong symmetric exchange property, there exist $j_1 > i_1$ such that $\mathbf{u}_1(j_1) - \mathbf{v}_1(j_1) = -1$ and that both $\mathbf{u}_1 - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i_1} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j_1}$ and $\mathbf{v}_1 + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i_1} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j_1}$ belong to B. Since $s(\mathbf{u}_1 - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i_1} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j_1}, \mathbf{v}_1 + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i_1} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j_1})$ is obtained from $s(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1)$ by exchanging $s_i(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1)$ and $s_j(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1)$ for suitable $j > i$, it follows that $c(\mathbf{u}_1 - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i_1} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j_1}, \mathbf{v}_1 + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i_1} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j_1}) \geq i + 1$.

Suppose next that $s_i(\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{v}_1) = -$. Similarly as the case above, let i_1 be the entry of $\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{v}_1$ corresponding to $s_i(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1)$. Then, since $\mathbf{u}_1(i_1) - \mathbf{v}_1(i_1) = -1$ and $\mathbf{u}_1(i_1 + 1) + \cdots + \mathbf{u}_1(n) > \mathbf{v}_1(i_1 + 1) + \cdots + \mathbf{v}_1(n)$, the right-sided symmetric exchange property implies that there exists $j_1 > i_1$ such that $\mathbf{u}_1(j_1) - \mathbf{v}_1(j_1) = 1$ and that $\mathbf{u}_1 + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i_1} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j_1}$ and $\mathbf{v}_1 - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i_1} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j_1}$ belong to B. Again, we have $c(\mathbf{u}_1 + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i_1} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j_1}, \mathbf{v}_1 - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i_1} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j_1}) \geq i + 1$.

Thus in both cases we obtain a pair $(\mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}') \in B \times B$ such that $x_{\mathbf{u}_1}x_{\mathbf{v}_1} - x_{\mathbf{u}'}x_{\mathbf{v}'} \in E_B$ and $c(\mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}') > c(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1)$. Hence the claim follows by induction.

Now let $(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_2)$ be as in the claim. Since $x_{\mathbf{u}_1}x_{\mathbf{v}_1} - x_{\mathbf{u}_2}x_{\mathbf{v}_2} \in E_B$, we have $\mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{u}_2 + \mathbf{v}_2$, and so $\mathrm{sort}(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1) = \mathrm{sort}(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_2)$. But $(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_2)$ is sorted, hence $\mathrm{sort}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = (\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_2) \in B \times B$. This implies B is sortable and so I_B has a Gröbner base consisting of sorting relations by [4, Lemma 5.2].

(b) From the proofs of (a), we see that for any $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in B \times B$, we have $x_{\mathbf{u}}x_{\mathbf{v}} - x_{\mathbf{u}'}x_{\mathbf{v}'} \in E_B$, where $(\mathbf{u}', \mathbf{v}') = \mathrm{sort}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$. This implies that all sorting relations belong to E_B. Hence $I_B = E_B$, as required. □

2. Pruned Lattice path Polymatroids

In this section we will give an alternative definition of a pruned lattice path polymatroid and show that this class of discrete polymatroids satisfies the two-sided strong symmetric exchange property. In addition, we will present some basic properties of this class of discrete polymatroids.



$$(n,r) = (8,5)$$
$$N(\alpha) = \{1,2,3,7\} \text{ and } N(\beta) = \{3,7,10,11\}$$
$$(\mathcal{M}(\alpha,\beta)) = P_{[1,3]}P_{[1,6]}P_{[1,8]}P_{[4,8]}$$
$$E_\sigma = (2,3,3,3,5,5,5) \text{ and } m(\sigma) = x_1x_2x_5^2$$

FIGURE 1.

Firstly we recall from [10] some definitions and some facts about lattice path polymatroids. Fix two integers $n, r \geq 1$. A *lattice path* is a sequence of unit-length steps in the plane, each either due north or east, beginning at the point $(1,1)$ and ending at the point (n,r). Note that a lattice path in the original definition of [10] begins at the original point $(0,0)$. We make such an adaption because we want to consider monomials in the polynomial ring $K[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$. In our setting, it needs $n+r-2$ steps from the beginning to the end. Fix a lattice path σ. Define a set $N(\sigma) \subseteq [n+r-2]$ by the following rule: $i \in N(\sigma) \Leftrightarrow$ the ith step of σ is north. Similarly, $E(\sigma)$ is the subset of $[n+r-2]$ defined by $i \in E(\sigma) \Leftrightarrow$ the ith step of σ is east. Hence $E(\sigma) = [n+r-2] \setminus N(\sigma)$. We also define vectors N_σ and E_σ as follows: the ith entry of N_σ is the the vertical coordinate of ith north step, and Similarly, the ith entry of E_σ is the horizontal coordinate of ith east step. We see that if $E(\sigma) = \{a_1,\ldots,a_{n-1}\}$ with $a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_{n-1}$, then $E_\sigma = (a_1, a_2-1\ldots, a_{n-1}-(n-2))$. Similarly, if $N(\sigma) = \{b_1,\ldots,b_{r-1}\}$ with $b_1 < b_2 < \cdots < b_{r-1}$, then $N_\sigma = (b_1, b_2-1\ldots, b_{r-1}-(r-2))$. Let $m(\sigma)$ be the monomial $x_1^{u_1}\cdots x_n^{u_n}$, where u_i is the degree of x_i is the number of north steps along the vertical line $x=i$. We see that if $m(\sigma) = x_1^{u_1}\cdots x_n^{u_n}$ and $E_\sigma = (a_1,\ldots,a_n)$, then $u_1+\cdots+u_i = a_i - 1$ for $i = 1,\ldots,n-1$ and $u_1+\cdots+u_n = r-1$.

Let σ and τ be lattice paths. We say that σ is above τ if $E_\sigma \geq E_\tau$, that is, the ith entry of E_σ is greater than or equal to the ith one of E_τ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. In this case, we write $\sigma \succeq \tau$. Now fix two lattice paths α and β with $\alpha \preceq \beta$ and set $\mathcal{M}(\alpha,\beta) = \{m(\sigma)\colon\ \alpha \preceq \sigma \preceq \beta\}$. Then the exponent set $\log \mathcal{M}(\alpha,\beta) = \{\mathbf{u}\colon\ \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{M}(\alpha,\beta)\}$ of $\mathcal{M}(\alpha,\beta)$ is the set of bases of a discrete polymatroid, which is called a *lattice path polymatroid*. Assume that $E_\alpha = (\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_{n-1})$ and $E_\beta = (\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_{n-1})$.

Then, for a vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{M}(\alpha, \beta)$ if and only if

$$\alpha_i \leq u_1 + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i \text{ for } \ i = 1, \cdots, n-1 \text{ and } u_1 + \cdots + u_n = r - 1.$$

Recall that a discrete polymatroid is *transversal* if its polymatroidal ideal is the product of some monomial prime ideals. It was observed in [10] that every lattice path polymatroid is transversal. More exactly, if we denote by I the polymatroidal ideal of a lattice path polymatroid whose set of bases is $\log \mathcal{M}(\alpha, \beta)$ and assume that $N_\beta = (s_1, \ldots, s_d)$ and $N_\alpha = (t_1, \ldots, t_d)$, then $I = P_{[s_1,t_1]} \cdots P_{[s_d,t_d]}$. Here $d = r-1$ and $P_{[s,t]}$ is the monomial prime ideal $(x_s, x_{s+1}, \ldots, x_t)$. The converse statement of this also true by observing carefully: namely, if $I = P_{[s_1,t_1]} \cdots P_{[s_d,t_d]}$ with $s_1 \leq \ldots \leq s_d$, $t_1 \leq \ldots \leq t_d$ and $s_i \leq t_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$, then I is the polymatroidal ideal of some lattice path polymatroid. In conclusion we have

Lemma 2.1. *Let I be a monomial ideal of degree d. Then I is a lattice path polymatroidal ideal if and only if $I = P_{[s_1,t_1]} \cdots P_{[s_d,t_d]}$ for some s_i, t_i satisfying $s_1 \leq \ldots \leq s_d$, $t_1 \leq \ldots \leq t_d$ and $s_i \leq t_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$.*

Let B be the set of bases of a discrete polymatroid $\mathbf{P}$ on the ground set $[n]$ and $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ a vector in $\mathbb{Z}_+^n$. Then

$$B_{\mathbf{v}} = \{\mathbf{u} \in B \colon \ u_i \leq v_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n\}$$

is again the set of bases of a discrete polymatroid, which is denoted by $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{v}}$. We call $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{v}}$ a *pruned polymatroid* of $\mathbf{P}$.

Now, we give the following alternative definition of pruned lattice path polymatroid.

Definition 2.2. Let n, d be positive integers and given vectors $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n), \mathbf{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_n), \boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n), \boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n)$ in $\mathbb{Z}_+^n$ such that $\alpha_1 \leq \cdots \leq \alpha_n = d$, $\beta_1 \leq \cdots \leq \beta_n = d$ and $\alpha_i \leq \beta_i$. A discrete polymatroid $\mathbf{P}$ on the ground set $[n]$ is called a *pruned path lattice polymatroid* or simply *a PLP-polymatroid* (of type $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$), if the set B of its bases consists of vectors $u \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ such that

$$a_i \leq u_i \leq b_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{1}$$

and

$$\alpha_i \leq u_1 + u_2 + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{2}$$

Let us explain this definition a little. If $\alpha_i = 0$ and $\beta_i = d$ for all $i \leq n-1$, then the first $n-1$ inequalities in (2) can be dropped and so $\mathbf{P}$ is a discrete polymatroid of Veronese type. If all $a_i = 0$ and all $b_i \geq d$, then all inequalities in (1) can be dropped and $\mathbf{P}$ is a lattice path polymatroid; If this is the case, we say that $\mathbf{P}$ is a lattice path polymatroid of type $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ or a LP-polymatroid of type $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ for short.

We also say that a monomial ideal I is a PLP-polymatroidal ideal (of type $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$) if it is a polymatroidal ideal of a PLP-polymatroid (of type $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$) and that a monomial ideal I is a LP-polymatroidal ideal (of type $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$) if it is a polymatroidal ideal of a LP-polymatroid (of type $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$)

As an example, consider the graphic matroid $\mathcal{M}$ of the graph G as shown in Figure 2.



FIGURE 2.

We will show that $\mathcal{M}$ is a PLP-polymatroid. Let B be the set of bases of $\mathcal{M}$. Every element in B is identified with a 0-1 vector of dimension 10. Since a set of 7 edges of G forms a spanning tree of G if and only if it does not contain a cycle, a 0-1 vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{10}$ belongs to B if and only if $\mathbf{u}$ satisfies the following system of inequalities:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{4} u_i \leq 3, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{7} u_i \leq 5, \quad \sum_{i=4}^{7} u_i \leq 3, \quad \sum_{i=7}^{10} u_i \leq 3, \quad \sum_{i=4}^{10} u_i \leq 5, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{10} u_i = 7.$$

One can check that this set of inequalities is equivalent to the following set of inequalities

$$2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{3} u_i, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{4} u_i \leq 3, \quad 4 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{6} u_i, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{7} u_i \leq 5, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{10} u_i = 7.$$

This shows that $\mathcal{M}$ is indeed a PLP-polymatroid.

As another example, consider the transversal ideal $(x_1, x_2)(x_3, x_4)(x_1, x_3)$. It is a monomial ideal generated by $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in k[x_1, \ldots, x_4]$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying: $0 \leq u_i \leq 2$ for $i = 1, 3$, $0 \leq u_i \leq 1$ for $i = 2, 4$, $1 \leq u_1 + u_2 \leq 2$ and $u_1 + u_2 + u_3 + u_4 = 3$. Hence it is a PLP-polymatroidal ideal, but not a LP-polymatroidal ideal.

Proposition 2.3. *Let* $\mathbf{P}$ *be a PLP-polymatroid with* B *as its set of bases. Then* $\mathbf{P}$ *satisfies the two-sided strong symmetric exchange property.*

Proof. We only need to prove that B satisfies the left-sided strong symmetric exchange property, since the other case is treated similarly. Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$ be two vectors of B such that $u_i < v_i$, where $1 < i \leq n$ and $u_1 + \cdots + u_{i-1} > v_1 + \cdots + v_{i-1}$. Then there is $1 \leq k \leq i-1$ such that $u_k > v_k$. Let j be the largest number k with this property. We will show that both $\mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$ and $\mathbf{v} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$ belong to B. For this, we write $\mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i = (t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n)$, that is, $t_k = u_k$ if $k \notin \{j, i\}$ and $t_j = u_j - 1$, $t_i = u_i + 1$. Since $\mathbf{P}$ is a PLP-polymatroid, we may assume that the elements of B satisfy the inequalities of Definition 2.2.

It is clear that $a_k \leq t_k \leq b_k$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, n$. If $k \leq j-1$ or $k \geq i$, then $t_1 + \cdots + t_k = u_1 + \cdots + u_k$, and in particular, $\alpha_k \leq t_1 + \cdots + t_k \leq \beta_k$. Fix $k \in [j, i-1]$. Then $t_1 + \cdots + t_k = u_1 + \cdots + u_k - 1 \leq \beta_k$. Note that $u_{k+1} \leq v_{k+1}, \cdots, u_{i-1} \leq v_{i-1}$

by the choice of j, it follows that $u_1 + \cdots + u_k > v_1 + \cdots + v_k$ and so $t_1 + \cdots + t_k = u_1 + \cdots + u_k - 1 \geq v_1 + \cdots + v_k \geq \alpha_k$. Hence $\mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \in B$. Similarly $\mathbf{v} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \in B$, as required. □

Example 2.4. Let $I = (x_1, x_3)(x_2, x_4)$. Then I is a polymatroidal ideal of a discrete polymatroid satisfying the two-sided strong symmetric exchange property. If I is a PLP-polymatroidal ideal, then there exist $a_i, b_i, i = 1, \ldots, 4$ and α_2, β_2 such that I is generated by monomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying

$$a_i \leq u_i \leq b_i, i = 1, \ldots, 4, \qquad \alpha_2 \leq u_1 + u_2 \leq \beta_2, \qquad u_1 + \cdots + u_4 = 2.$$

Note that the inequality $\alpha_3 \leq u_1 + u_2 + u_3 \leq \beta_3$ does not appear in the conditions above since it is equivalent to the inequality $d - \beta_3 \leq u_4 \leq d - \alpha_3$. Since u_1 can be 1, it follows that $b_1 \geq 1$. Proceeding in this way, we have $a_i = 0, b_i \geq 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 4$ and $\alpha_2 = 0$, $\beta_2 \geq 2$. Therefore we have $x_1 x_3 \in I$, a contradiction. Hence I is not a PLP-polymatroidal ideal. However, I is *isomorphic* to the lattice path polymatroidal ideal $(x_1, x_2)(x_3, x_4)$. Till now, we cannot find a discrete polymatroid satisfying the one-sided symmetric exchange property which is not isomorphic to a PLP-polymatroid.

In [6], it was proved that a discrete polymatroid satisfies the strong symmetric exchange property if and only if it is isomorphic to a discrete polymatroid of Veronese type. For two classes of discrete polymatroids we will show that the one-sided strong symmetric exchange property implies the property of being a PLP-polymatroid.

To prove those results and later use, we need to recall some definitions and facts one can find in [4] or [5]. A *polymatroid* on the ground set $[n]$ is a convex polytope $\mathcal{P}$ contained in $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ such that

(1) if $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ is a vector $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ with $\mathbf{v} \leq \mathbf{u}$, then $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{P}$,

(2) if $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{P}$ with $|\mathbf{v}| > |\mathbf{u}|$, there exists a vector $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\mathbf{u} < \mathbf{w} \leq \mathbf{u} \vee \mathbf{v}$.

Here $\mathbf{u} \vee \mathbf{v} = (\max\{u_1, v_1\}, \ldots, \max\{u_n, v_n\})$.

The ground set rank function of $\mathcal{P}$ is a function: $\rho : 2^{[n]} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ defined by $\rho(A) = \max\{\mathbf{u}(A) \colon \ \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}\}$ together with $\rho(\emptyset) = 0$. Recall that $\mathbf{u}(A)$ denotes the number $\sum_{i \in A} \mathbf{u}(i)$.

The function is *nondecreasing*, i.e., $\rho(A) \leq \rho(B)$ if $A \subseteq B \subseteq [n]$ and is *submodular*, i.e.,

$$\rho(A) + \rho(B) \geq \rho(A \cup B) + \rho(A \cap B)$$

for any $A, B \subseteq [n]$.

Conversely, if given a nondecreasing and submodular function $\rho : 2^{[n]} \to \mathbb{R}_+$, then the set

$$\{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \colon \ \mathbf{u}(A) \leq \rho(A) \quad \text{for all} \quad A \in 2^{[n]}\}$$

is a polymatroid.

An *integral polymatroid* is a polymatroid for which every vertex is a lattice point, that is, a vector in $\mathbb{Z}^n_+$. A polymatroid is integral if and only if its ground set rank function is integer valued. If $\mathcal{P}$ is an integral polymatroid then $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n_+$ is a discrete polymatroid. Conversely if $\mathbf{P}$ is a discrete polymatroid on the ground set $[n]$, then

$\mathcal{P} = \text{conv}(\mathbf{P})$, the convex hull of $\mathbf{P}$, is an integral polymatroid with $\mathbf{P} = \mathcal{P} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n_+$. Thus the ground set rank function of an integral polymatroid $\mathcal{P}$ is determined by its values on its corresponding discrete polymatroid $\mathbf{P} = \mathcal{P} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n_+$, namely, if ρ is the ground set rank function of $\mathcal{P}$, then $\rho(A) = \max\{\mathbf{u}(A) \colon \ \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{P}\}$, see [4, Theorem 3.4] and its proof. Furthermore we have the following decomposition of $\mathbf{P}$ in this case:

$$\mathbf{P} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n_+ \colon \ \mathbf{u}(A) \leq \rho(A) \quad \text{for all} \quad A \in 2^{[n]}\}. \tag{3}$$

Let $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_k$ be polymatroids on the ground set $[n]$. The *polymatroidal sum* $\mathcal{P}_1 \bigvee \ldots \bigvee \mathcal{P}_k$ of $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_k$ is the subset of $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ consisting of all vectors $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$ of the form $\mathbf{u} = \sum_{i \in [k]} \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_i \in \mathcal{P}_i$. By [5, Theorem 12.1.5], $\mathcal{P}_1 \bigvee \ldots \bigvee \mathcal{P}_k$ is again a polymatroid with $\sum_{i \in [k]} \rho_i$ its ground set rank function. Here ρ_i is the ground set rank function of $\mathcal{P}_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. It follows that if all $\mathcal{P}_i$ are integral then their polymatroidal sum is integral. Similarly, one can define the polymatroidal sum of discrete polymatroids. Let $\mathbf{P}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{P}_k$ be discrete polymatroids on the ground set $[n]$, and let B_i be the set of bases of $\mathbf{P}_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Then $\mathbf{P}_1 \bigvee \ldots \bigvee \mathbf{P}_k = \{\mathbf{u}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{u}_k \colon \ \mathbf{u}_i \in \mathbf{P}_i\}$ is a discrete polymatroid and the set of its bases is $B_1 + \cdots + B_k$.

Let ρ be the ground set rank function of a discrete polymatroid $\mathbf{P}$. A subset $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq [n]$ is called *ρ-closed* if $\rho(A) < \rho(B)$ for any subset $B \subseteq [n]$ which contains A properly and a subset $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq [n]$ is called *ρ-separable* if there exist nonempty subsets A_1, A_2 with $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$ and $A_1 \cup A_2 = A$ such that $\rho(A) = \rho(A_1) + \rho(A_2)$.

For $i \in [n]$, we let

$$\mathcal{H}^i_+ = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \colon \ \mathbf{u}(i) \geq 0\}.$$

And for $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq [n]$, let

$$\mathcal{H}^+_A = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \colon \ \mathbf{u}(A) \leq \rho(A)\}.$$

By [4, Proposition 7.2], a result taken from [2], and by [5, Theorem B.1.6], we see that $\mathbf{P}$ has the following irredundant decomposition

$$\mathbf{P} = (\cap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}^i_+) \cap (\cap_A \mathcal{H}^+_A), \tag{4}$$

where A ranges through all ρ-inseparable and ρ-closed subset of $[n]$. Moreover this is the unique irredundant decomposition of $\mathbf{P}$ by [5, Theorem B.1.7] in the sense that every irredundant decomposition of $\mathbf{P}$ as the intersection of closed half-spaces concides with (4). In what follows, if $A = \{i_1, \ldots, i_s\}$ we denote $\rho(A)$ by $\rho(i_1, \ldots, i_s)$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\mathbf{P}$ be a discrete polymatroid on the ground set $[n]$ with the ground set rank function ρ. If every ρ-closed and ρ-inseparable subset of $[n]$ belongs to T, then $\mathbf{P}$ is a PLP-polymatroid. Here*

$$T = \{[i] \colon \ i \in [n]\} \cup \{[n] \setminus [i] \colon \ i \in [n]\} \cup \{\{i\} \colon \ i \in [n]\} \cup \{[n] \setminus \{i\} \colon \ i \in [n]\}.$$

Proof. Let T_1 be the set of ρ-closed and ρ-inseparable subset of $[n]$. In view of (4) we have

$$\mathbf{P} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n_+ \colon \ \mathbf{u}(A) \leq \rho(A) \text{ for any } A \in T_1\}.$$

This together with (3) implies $\mathbf{P} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n \colon \mathbf{u}(A) \leq \rho(A) \text{ for any } A \in T\}$ and so

$$B(\mathbf{P}) = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n \colon \mathbf{u}(A) \leq \rho(A) \text{ for any } A \in T \text{ and } \mathbf{u}([n]) = \rho([n])\}$$

Set $d = \rho([n])$. For $i = 1, \ldots, n$, we set

$$b_i = \rho(i) \qquad \text{and} \qquad a_i = d - \rho([n] \setminus \{i\}),$$

and set

$$\beta_i = \rho([i]) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \alpha_i = d - \rho([n] \setminus [i]).$$

It follows that $\mathbf{P}$ is a PLP-polymatroid of type $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$. □

Proposition 2.6. *Let* $\mathbf{P}$ *be a discrete polymatroid on the ground set* $[4]$ *and suppose that* $\rho(i) < \min\{\rho(i,3), \rho(i,4)\}$ *for* $i = 1, 2$. *Then* $\mathbf{P}$ *satisfies the left-sided strong symmetric exchange property if and only if it is a PLP-polymatroid.*

Proof. If $\rho(i) = 0$ for some i, $\mathbf{P}$ is isomorphic to a discrete polymatroid on the ground set $[n]$ with $n \leq 3$. Therefore $\mathbf{P}$ is of Veronese type (see [4, Example 2.6]) and there is nothing to prove. Hence we may assume that $\rho(i) > 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 4$.

The proof of the "if" part follows from Proposition 2.3.

Proof of the "only if" part: Set $d = \rho([4])$. Suppose that for some $i \in [4]$, say for $i = 1$, such that $c = \rho([4] \setminus \{i\}) < d$. Then $u_4 \geq d - c$ for any $\mathbf{u} \in B$. Let $B' = \{\mathbf{u} - (d-c)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_4 \colon \mathbf{u} \in B\}$. It follows that B' is the set of bases of a discrete polymatroid $\mathbf{P}'$ whose ground set rank function ρ' satisfies $\rho'([3]) = \rho'([4])$. Note that $\mathbf{P}'$ satisfies the left-sided strong symmetric exchange property if and only if $\mathbf{P}$ satisfies the same property and that $\mathbf{P}'$ is a PLP-polymatroid if and only if $\mathbf{P}$ is a PLP-polymatroid. Hence we assume that $\rho([4] \setminus \{i\}) = \rho([4]) = d$ for all i from the beginning.

Assume that $\mathbf{P}$ is not a pruned lattice path polymatroid. Then, by Proposition 2.5, there is one pair $\{i,j\} \in \{\{2,3\}, \{1,4\}, \{1,3\}, \{2,4\}\}$ such that $\{i,j\}$ is ρ-closed and ρ-inseparable, i.e., $\rho(i,j) < \rho(i) + \rho(j)$ and $\rho(i,j) < d$.

If $\{i,j\} = \{1,4\}$, then we check that the vector $\mathbf{u} = (\rho(1,4) - \rho(4), d - \rho(1,4), 0, \rho(4))$ and the vector $\mathbf{v} = (\rho(1,4) - \rho(4) + 1, d - \rho(1,4) - 1, 1, \rho(4) - 1)$ belong to B by (3). Here we used the assumption that $\rho(1) < \rho(1,3)$. Now by the left-sided strong symmetric exchange property of B, it follows that the vector $u' = (\rho(1,4) - \rho(4) + 1, d - \rho(1,4) - 1, 0, \rho(4))$ belongs to B, a contradiction since $u'_1 + u'_4 = \rho(1,4) + 1$.

If $\{i,j\} = \{1,3\}$, consider vectors $\mathbf{u} = (\rho(1,3) - \rho(3), d - \rho(1,3), \rho(3), 0)$ and $\mathbf{v} = (\rho(1,3) - \rho(3) + 1, d - \rho(1,3) - 1, \rho(3) - 1, 1)$.

If $\{i,j\} = \{2,3\}$, consider vectors $\mathbf{u} = (d - \rho(2,3), \rho(2,3) - \rho(3), \rho(3), 0)$ and $\mathbf{v} = (d - \rho(2,3) - 1, \rho(2,3) - \rho(3) + 1, \rho(3) - 1, 0)$.

Finally, if $\{i,j\} = \{2,4\}$, consider vectors $\mathbf{u} = (d - \rho(2,4), \rho(2,4) - \rho(4), 0, \rho(4)$ and $\mathbf{v} = (d - \rho(2,4) - 1, \rho(2,4) - \rho(4) + 1, 1, \rho(4) - 1)$.

In each of these cases, we obtain a contradiction as in the case when $\{i,j\} = \{1,4\}$. This completes the proof. □

In view of Example 2.4, the conditions that $\rho(i) < \min\{\rho(i,3), \rho(i,4)\}$ for $i = 1, 2$ in Proposition 2.6 cannot be skipped in general.

In the remaining part of this paper $P_{[a,b]}$ always denotes the monomial prime ideal generated by variables x_i with $i \in [c,d]$.

Lemma 2.7. *Let B be the set of bases of a discrete polymatroid $\mathbf{P}_1$ and C be the set of bases of the discrete polymatroid $\mathbf{P}_2$ whose polymatroidal ideal is the transversal ideal $P_{[a,b]}P_{[c,d]}$ with $c < a < b < d$. Then*

$$B + C = \{\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v} \colon \ \mathbf{u} \in B, \mathbf{v} \in C\}$$

satisfies neither the right- nor the left-sided strong symmetric exchange property.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_1 \bigvee \mathbf{P}_2$, and let ρ_1, ρ_2, ρ be the ground set rank functions of $\mathbf{P}_1, \mathbf{P}_2, \mathbf{P}$ respectively. Note that $B + C$ is the set of bases of $\mathbf{P}$. By [4, Lemma 3.2], there exists $\mathbf{w} \in B$ such that $w_c + w_d = \rho_1(c,d)$. Let $\mathbf{u} = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_c + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_b$ and $\mathbf{v} = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_a + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_d$. Then both $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ belong to C. Assume $B + C$ satisfies the right-sided strong symmetric exchange property. Since $(\mathbf{w}+\mathbf{u})_b > (\mathbf{w}+\mathbf{v})_b$ and $\sum_{i>b}(\mathbf{w}+\mathbf{u})_i < \sum_{i>b}(\mathbf{w}+\mathbf{v})_i$, the right-sided strong symmetric exchange property implies that $\mathbf{w}+\mathbf{u}-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_b+\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_d = \mathbf{w}+\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_c+\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_d$ belongs to $B+C$. Hence $\rho(c,d) \geq \rho_1(c,d)+2$, which is impossible, since $\rho(c,d) \leq \rho_1(c,d) + \rho_2(c,d)$ and $\rho_2(c,d) = 1$. Similarly, $B + C$ does not satisfy the left-sided strong symmetric exchange property. □

Proposition 2.8. *Let $\mathbf{P}$ be the discrete polymatroid whose polymatroidal ideal I is $P_{[s_1,t_1]} \cdots P_{[s_d,t_d]}$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) $\mathbf{P}$ *satisfies the one-sided strong symmetric exchange property;*

(b) *after a suitable rearrangement of the factors of I, we have*

$$s_1 \leq s_2 \leq \cdots \leq s_d \quad \text{and} \quad t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \cdots \leq t_d;$$

(c) $\mathbf{P}$ *is a lattice path polymatroid.*

Proof. $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$: We can rearrange the order of prime ideals in the expression of $I = P_{[s_1,t_1]} \cdots P_{[s_d,t_d]}$ in this way: if $s_i < s_j$, then $P_{[s_i,t_i]}$ is placed before $P_{[s_j,t_j]}$; if $s_i = s_j$ and $t_i \leq t_j$, then $P_{[s_i,t_i]}$ is placed before $P_{[s_j,t_j]}$. After this rearrangement, we have $s_1 \leq s_2 \leq \cdots \leq s_d$ and $t_i \leq t_j$ for any $i < j$ with $s_i = s_j$. It suffices to prove that $t_i \leq t_j$ if $s_i < s_j$. But this follows from Lemma 2.7.

$(b) \Rightarrow (c)$ follows from Lemma 2.1 and $(c) \Rightarrow (a)$ follows from Proposition 2.3. □

In the following proposition we will show that any power of a PLP-polymatroidal ideal is again a PLP-polymatroidal ideal.

Proposition 2.9. *Let I be the PLP-polymatroidal ideal of type $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$. Then I^k is the PLP-polymatroidal ideal of type $(k\mathbf{a}, k\mathbf{b}|k\boldsymbol{\alpha}, k\boldsymbol{\beta})$ for any $k > 1$.*

Proof. Let J be the PLP-polymatroidal ideal of type $(k\mathbf{a}, k\mathbf{b}|k\boldsymbol{\alpha}, k\boldsymbol{\beta})$. Then $I^k \subseteq J$. Let $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} = x_1^{u_1} \ldots x_n^{u_n}$ be a minimal generator in J. We will show that there are minimal generators $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}_1}, \ldots, x^{\mathbf{v}_k}$ of I such that $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}_1} \ldots \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}_k}$, that is, $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{v}_k$.

For each i, there exist s_i, t_i such that $u_1 + \cdots + u_i = ks_i + t_i$ and $0 \leq t_i < k$. For $j = 1, \ldots, k$ we define $\mathbf{v}_j$ by

$$\mathbf{v}_j(1) + \cdots + \mathbf{v}_j(i) = s_i + 1, \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq j \leq t_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n,$$

and

$$\mathbf{v}_j(1) + \cdots + \mathbf{v}_j(i) = s_i, \quad \text{for} \quad t_i + 1 \leq j \leq k, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

To show that $\mathbf{v}_j$ belongs to $\mathbb{Z}_+^n$ for all $i \in [k]$, we only need to show that $\mathbf{v}_j(1) + \cdots + \mathbf{v}_j(i+1) \geq \mathbf{v}_j(1) + \cdots + \mathbf{v}_j(i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $j \in [k]$. Since $s_{i+1} \geq s_i$, we can assume that $\mathbf{v}_j(1) + \cdots + \mathbf{v}_j(i+1) = s_{i+1}$ and $\mathbf{v}_j(1) + \cdots + \mathbf{v}_j(i) = s_i + 1$. Note that in this case, $j > t_{i+1}$ and $j \leq t_i$. This implies $t_{i+1} < t_i$. Since $ks_{i+1} + t_{i+1} \geq ks_i + t_i$, it follows that $ks_{i+1} > ks_i$ and so $s_{i+1} \geq s_i + 1$, as required.

Since

$$\sum_{1 \leq j \leq k} \mathbf{v}_j(1) + \cdots + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k} \mathbf{v}_j(i) = ks_i + t_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,$$

we have $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{v}_k$.

We have $\alpha_i \leq \mathbf{v}_j(1) + \cdots + \mathbf{v}_j(i) \leq \beta_i$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$, since $k\alpha_i \leq ks_i + t_i \leq k\beta_i$.

It remains to be shown that $a_i \leq \mathbf{v}_j(i) \leq b_i$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$. If $t_i > t_{i-1}$, then $\mathbf{v}_j(i)$ is either $s_i + 1 - s_{i-1}$ or $s_i - s_{i-1}$. Note that $u_i = k(s_i - s_{i-1}) + t_i - t_{i-1}$. Therefore we have $a_i \leq s_i - s_{i-1} + \frac{1}{k}(t_i - t_{i-1}) \leq b_i$, and hence $a_i \leq \mathbf{v}_j(i) \leq b_i$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$.

Similarly one shows that $a_i \leq \mathbf{v}_j(i) \leq b_i$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$ when $t_i = t_{i-1}$ or $t_i < t_{i-1}$. This completes our proof. □

We do not know if the product of PLP-polymatroidal ideals is always a PLP-polymatroidal ideal. However there is an example to show the product of LP-polymatroidal ideals may be not a LP-polymatroidal ideal.

Example 2.10. Set $I_1 = (x_1x_2^2x_3^2, x_1x_2^3x_3, x_2^3x_3^2, x_2^4x_3)$ and set $I_2 = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$. Then I_1 and I_2 are LP-polymatroidal ideals of type $((0,3,5),(1,4,5))$ and $((0,0,1),(1,1,1))$ respectively. We claim that I_1I_2 is not a LP-polymatroidal ideal. If it is, there are $\alpha_i, \beta_i, i = 1,2$ such that I_1I_2 is generated by $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying $\alpha_1 \leq u_1 \leq \beta_1, \alpha_2 \leq u_1 + u_2 \leq \beta_2, u_1 + u_2 + u_3 = 6$. One have $a_1 = 0, b_1 \geq 2$ and $a_2 \leq 3, b_2 \geq 5$. This implies $x_1^2x_2x_3^3 \in I_1I_2$, a contradiction.

3. Gorensteinness of base rings of a special type of PLP-polymatroid

Let $\mathbf{P}$ be a PLP-polymatroid for which the set B of its bases consists of vectors $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ satisfying:

$$0 \leq u_i \leq b_i \qquad \text{for} \qquad i = 1, \ldots, k,$$

$$u_1 + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i \qquad \text{for} \qquad i = k+1, \ldots, n-1,$$

and

$$u_1 + \cdots + u_n = d.$$

Here $b_i > 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$ and $1 \leq \beta_{k+1} \leq \ldots \leq \beta_{n-1} \leq d$. We call this special type of PLP-polymatroids to be *SPLP-polymatroids*. In this section, we will classify

SPLP-polymatroids whose base rings are Gorenstein. We do this in two steps. First we identity the base ring of a SPLP-polymatroid with the Ehrhart ring of a certain integral polymatroid. Then our result follows by applying [4, Theorem 7.3], which describes perfectly the integral polymatroids whose Ehrhart rings are Gorenstein.

In general, if $\mathcal{P}$ is an integral convex polytope contained in $\mathbb{R}^n_+$, then the *Ehrhart ring* $K[\mathcal{P}]$ is defined to be the K-subalgeba of $K[t_1, \ldots, t_n, s]$ generated by monomials $\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{u}}s^i$ with $\mathbf{u} \in i\mathcal{P} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n_+$. Let $\mathbf{P}$ be a discrete polymatroid and $\mathcal{P}$ the convex hull of $\mathbf{P}$. Then, since $\mathcal{P}$ has the integer decomposition property, the Ehrhart ring $K[\mathcal{P}]$ is isomorphic to $K[\mathbf{P}]$, which by definition is the K-subalgeba of $K[t_1, \ldots, t_n, s]$ generated by monomials $\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{u}}s$ with $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{P}$, see [4]. Recall that an integral convex polytope $\mathcal{P}$ is said to have the *integer decomposition property* provided that for any integer $q \geq 1$ and any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{Z}^n_+$ which belongs to $q\mathcal{P} = \{q\mathbf{v}\colon\ \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{P}\}$, there exist $\mathbf{u}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_q \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n_+$ such that $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{u}_q$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mathbf{P}$ be a SPLP-polymatroid as given above. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) *the base ring $K[B(\mathbf{P})]$ is Gorenstein.*

(2) *for any $k+1 \leq i \leq n-2$ with $\beta_i < \beta_{i+1}$ and for any $1 \leq j \leq k$ with $b_j < \beta_{k+1}$, one has:*

$$\frac{i+1}{\beta_i} = \frac{2}{b_j} = \frac{n}{\beta_{n-1}}$$

is a positive integer.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{P}'$ be the set of integer vectors $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \ldots, u_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}_+$ subject to the first $n-1$ linear inequalities in the definition of a SPLP-polymatroid. Then $\mathbf{P}'$ is a discrete polymatroid on the ground set $[n-1]$. We claim that $K[B(\mathbf{P})] \cong K[\mathbf{P}']$. In fact, $K[B] = K[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{u}}s^{d-|\mathbf{u}|}\colon\ \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{P}']$ and $K[\mathbf{P}'] = K[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{u}}s\colon\ \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{P}']$. Since for any coefficients $k_{\mathbf{u}} \in K$ with $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{P}'$, $\sum_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathbf{P}'} k_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{u}, d-|\mathbf{u}|) = 0$ if and only if $\sum_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathbf{P}} k_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{u}, 1) = 0$, it follows that $K[B(\mathbf{P})]$ and $K[\mathbf{P}']$ have the same relation lattices and so $K[B(\mathbf{P})] \cong K[\mathbf{P}']$, as claimed.

Let ρ' be the ground set rank function of $\mathbf{P}'$. To determine the ρ'-closed and ρ'-inseparable subsets of $[n-1]$, we use the uniqueness of the irredudant decomposition of $\mathbf{P}'$. First by the definition of $\mathbf{P}'$, we have the following decomposition:

$$\mathbf{P}' = (\bigcap_{i=1}^{k}\{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}_+\colon\ u_i \leq b_i\}) \cap (\bigcap_{i=k+1}^{n-1}\{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}_+\colon\ u_1 + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i\}). \tag{5}$$

In general, if $A = \bigcap_{i\in I} A_i$, where I is a finite index set, then A_i is called *superfluous* in this decomposition if $A_i \supseteq \bigcap_{j\neq i} A_j$. We can omit all superfluous terms step and step to achieve an irredundant decomposition of A.

We observe the following facts:

(a) For $1 \leq i \leq k$, the term $\{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}_+\colon\ u_i \leq b_i\}$ is superfluous in (5) if and only if $b_i \geq \beta_k$,

(b) For $k+1 \leq i \leq n-2$, the term $\{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}_+\colon\ u_1 + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i\}$ is superfluous in (5) if and only if $\beta_i = \beta_{i+1}$,

(c) the term $\{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{n-1} \colon\ u_1 + \cdots + u_{n-1} \leq \beta_{n-1}\}$ is not superfluous in (5).

We only prove (b) since the proofs of the other facts are similar.

If $\beta_i = \beta_{i+1}$, then the term $\{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{n-1} \colon\ u_1 + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i\}$ is superfluous since it contains $\{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{n-1} \colon\ u_1 + \cdots + u_{i+1} \leq \beta_{i+1}\}$.

If $\beta_i < \beta_{i+1}$, we define $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{n-1}$ by $u_i = \beta_{i+1}$ and $u_j = 0$ for $j \neq i$. Then $\mathbf{u}$ does not belong to $\mathbf{P}'$ since $u_1 + \cdots + u_i > \beta_i$, but it belongs to the decomposition obtained from (5) by dropping the term $\{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \colon\ u_1 + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i\}$. Hence $\{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \colon\ u_1 + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i\}$ is not superfluous. Thus we have proved (b).

Note that if two terms are superfluous in (5), then one term is still superfluous in the decomposition obtained from (5) by dropping the other term. Hence we achieve the unique irredundant decomposition of $\mathbf{P}'$ by dropping all superfluous terms in (5). It follows from [4, Proposition 7.2] and [5, Theorem 1.7] that there are three classes of ρ'-closed and ρ'-inseparable subsets of $[n-1]$: (1) the subsets $\{i\}$, where $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $b_i < \beta_k$, (2) the subsets $[i]$, where $k+1 \leq i \leq n-2$ and $\beta_i < \beta_{i+1}$, (3) $[n-1]$. Now we can apply [4, Theorem 7.3] and our result follows. □

4. Linear quotients for PLP-polymatroidal ideals

From this section on, we will turn to investigate the algebraic properties of polymatriodal ideals of certain PLP-polymatoids.

In view of [5, Theorem 12.6.2 and Theorem 12.7.2] and their proofs, we see that a polymatroidal ideal I has linear quotients if its minimal generators are arranged in either the lexicographical order or the reverse lexicographical order. In this section we will show that if I is a PLP-polymatroidal ideal, then its linear quotients are more easily trackable. We will use this result repeatedly in the following sections.

Remark 4.1. Let I be a PLP-polymatroidal ideal of type $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$. Then I is isomorphic to a PLP-polymatroidal ideal of type $(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{b}_1|\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, \boldsymbol{\beta}_1)$ for suitable vectors $\mathbf{b}_1, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_1$. In fact, let J be the ideal generated by monomials $x_1^{u_1} \cdots x_n^{u_n}$ satisfying

$$0 \leq u_i \leq b_i - a_i, \forall i = 1, \ldots, n$$

and

$$\alpha_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i} a_i \leq u_1 + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i} a_i, \forall i = 1, \ldots, n.$$

Then, since $I = x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n} J$, the ideals I and J are isomorphic as modules and hence I and J have the same projective dimension and the same depth. In what follows we always assume that I is a PLP-polymatroidal ideal of type $(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{b}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let I be a PLP-polymatroidal ideal of type $(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{b}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$. Let $G(I) = \{m_1, \ldots, m_r\}$ be the set of minimal generators of I such that $m_1 > m_2 > \cdots > m_r$ with respect to the lexicographical order. Fix $1 \leq q \leq r$ and let $J = (m_1, \ldots, m_{q-1})$. Write $m_q = x_1^{t_1} \cdots x_n^{t_n}$. Then*

(a) *x_n is not in $J : m_q$.*

(b) *for any* $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, $x_i \in J : m_q$ *if and only if* $t_i < b_i$ *and* $t_1 + \cdots + t_i < \beta_i$.

Proof. If $x_i \in J : m_q$, then there is $l < q$ with $x_i = m_l/[m_l, m_q]$. Here $[u, v]$ denotes the greatest common divisor of of the monomials u and v. Since $m_l > m_q$, we have $m_l = x_1^{t_1} \cdots x_i^{t_i+1} \cdots x_j^{t_j-1} \cdots x_n^{t_n}$ for some j with $j > i$. Hence $i < n$ and $x_n \notin J : m_q$. This proves (a).

Proof of (b): Let $i < n$ and $x_i \in J : m_q$. Then as in the proof of (a) there exists $m_l \in G(I)$ with $m_l = x_1^{t_1} \cdots x_i^{t_i+1} \cdots x_j^{t_j-1} \cdots x_n^{t_n}$ for some j with $j > i$. It follows that $t_i < t_i + 1 \leq b_i$ and $t_1 + \cdots + t_i < t_1 + \cdots + t_i + 1 \leq \beta_i$.

Conversely let $i < n$ and assume that $t_i < b_i$ and $t_1 + \cdots + t_i < \beta_i$. Let j be the smallest integer k with the property that $k > i$ and $t_1 + \cdots + t_k = \beta_k$. Note that such a k exists since $t_1 + \cdots + t_n = \beta_n$. By the choice of j, we have $t_j > \beta_j - \beta_{j-1} \geq 0$. Set $m = x_1^{t_1} \cdots x_i^{t_i+1} \cdots x_j^{t_j-1} \cdots x_n^{t_n}$. Then m belongs to $G(I)$ with $m > m_q$ and $m/[m, m_q] = x_i$. Hence $x_i \in J : m_q$, and this completes the proof of (b). □

For any $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} = x_1^{u_1} \cdots x_n^{u_n} \in G(I)$, we set

$$N(\mathbf{u}) = |\{1 \leq i \leq n-1 \colon\ u_i < b_i, u_1 + \cdots + u_i < \beta_i\}|. \tag{6}$$

As an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.2 together with [5, Corollary 8.2.2], we obtain:

Proposition 4.3. *Let* I *be a PLP-polymatroidal ideal of type* $(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{b}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$. *Then*

$$\operatorname{depth} S/I = n - 1 - \max\{N(\mathbf{u}) \colon\ \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in G(I)\}.$$

In the remaining part of this section we will determine the associated prime ideals of LP-polymatroidal ideals. we begin with:

Proposition 4.4. *Let* I *be a LP-polymatroidal ideal of type* $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$. *Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(a) depth $S/I = 0$;
(b) $\mathrm{m} \in \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$;
(c) $\alpha_i < \beta_i$ *for* $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$.

Here m *denotes the maximal homogeneous ideal* $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ *of* $S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$

Proof. The equivalence between (a) and (b) is well-known and it holds for all monomial ideals.

(a)⇔ (c): Note that in this special case,

$$N(\mathbf{u}) = |\{1 \leq i \leq n-1 \colon\ u_1 + \cdots + u_i < \beta_i\}|$$

for any $\mathbf{u}$ with $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in G(I)$. Let B denote the set of bases of our discrete polymatroid.

If $\alpha_i < \beta_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$, then $\mathbf{v} := (\alpha_1, \alpha_2 - \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n - \alpha_{n-1})$ belongs to B and $N(\mathbf{v}) = n - 1$. Hence depth $S/I = 0$ by Proposition 4.3. Conversely, if depth $S/I = 0$, then there exists $\mathbf{u} \in B$ such that $N(\mathbf{u}) = n - 1$ by Proposition 4.3 again. This implies $u_1 + \cdots + u_i < \beta_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$. Since $\alpha_i \leq u_1 + \cdots + u_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$ by definition, the result follows. □

Lemma 4.5. *Let I be a LP-polymatroidal ideal. Then every associated prime ideal of I is of the form $P_{[s,t]}$ for some $s \leq t$.*

Proof. The assertion follows from Lemma 2.1 together with [6, Theorem 3.7]. □

Following [7], we denote by $S(P)$ the polynomial ring in the variables belonging to P, and $I(P)$ the *monomial localization* of I at P. Recall that $I(P)$ is the monomial ideal of $S(P)$ obtained from I as the image of the map $\phi : S \to S(P)$ defined by $\phi(x_i) = x_i$ if $x_i \in P$ and $\phi(x_i) = 1$, otherwise. Let $A \subseteq [n]$. We denote by P_A the ideal $(x_i\colon\ i \in A)$, and denote $I(P_A)$ by $I(A)$ and $S(P_A)$ by $S(A)$ for short. One can check that if I, J are monomial ideals then $(IJ)(A) = I(A)J(A)$, and if $A \subseteq B$ then $I(A) = I(B)(A)$. In the later proofs we need the following facts.

Proposition 4.6. (a) *Let I be a monomial ideal. Then $P \in \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$ if and only if* $\operatorname{depth} S(P)/I(P) = 0$.

(b) *Let I be a polymatroidal ideal and fix $i \in [n]$. Set*

$$a_i = \max\{u_i\colon\ \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in G(I)\}.$$

Then $I([n] \setminus \{i\})$ is again a polymatroidal ideal. Moreover it is generated by monomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}/x^{a_i}$, where $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in G(I)$ with $u_i = a_i$.

Proof. (a) has been observed in [3, Lemma 2.11].

(b) see [7, Proposition 2.1] and its proof. □

Let I be a LP-polymatroidal ideal of type $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$. By Proposition 4.6(b) we have $I([s, n])$ is generated by $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying:

$$\max\{\alpha_i - \beta_{s-1}, 0\} \leq u_s + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i - \beta_{s-1} \qquad \text{for } i = s, \ldots, n,$$

and $I([1, t])$ is generated by $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying:

$$\alpha_i \leq u_1 + \cdots + u_i \leq \min\{\alpha_t, \beta_i\} \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, t.$$

Hence $I([s, t])$ is an ideal in $S([s, t])$ generated by $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying:

$$\max\{\alpha_i - \beta_{s-1}, 0\} \leq u_s + \cdots + u_i \leq \min\{\max\{\alpha_t - \beta_{s-1}, 0\}, \beta_i - \beta_{s-1}\}$$

for $i = s, \ldots, t$.

Proposition 4.7. *Let I be a LP-polymatroidal ideal of type $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$. Then $P_{[s,t]}$ belongs to $\operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$ if and only if $\alpha_i < \beta_i$ for $i = s, \ldots, t-1$ and $\beta_{s-1} < \beta_s$, $\beta_{s-1} < \alpha_t$, $\alpha_{t-1} < \alpha_t$. In particular, $(x_t) \in \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$ if and only if $\alpha_t > \beta_{t-1}$. Here we use the convention that $\beta_0 = 0$.*

Proof. In view of Lemma 4.6(a) and Proposition 4.4, we see that $P_{[s,t]}$ belongs to $\operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$ if and only if $\max\{\alpha_i - \beta_{s-1}, 0\} < \max\{\alpha_t - \beta_{s-1}, 0\}$ and $\max\{\alpha_i - \beta_{s-1}, 0\} < \beta_i - \beta_{s-1}$ for $i = s, \ldots, t-1$, which is equivalent to the conditions given in Proposition 4.7. □

5. The depth and the associated prime ideals of left PLP-polymatroidal ideals

A PLP-polymatroidal ideal I in $S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ is called a *left PLP-polymatroidal ideal*, if I is generated by monomials $\mathbf{x^u}$ such that

$$0 \leq u_i \leq b_i \qquad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq k,$$

and

$$\alpha_{k+i} \leq u_1 + \cdots + u_{k+i} \leq \beta_{k+i} \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n-k,$$

where $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $b_i > 0$, $\alpha_{k+1} \leq \cdots \leq \alpha_n = d$, $\beta_{k+1} \leq \cdots \leq \beta_n = d$. Hence a left PLP-polymatroidal ideal is a PLP-polymatroidal ideal of type $(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{b}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ such that there exists $k \in [2, n-1]$ such that $b_i \geq d$ for all $i \geq k+1$ and $\alpha_i = 0$, $\beta_i = \beta_{k+1}$ for all $i \leq k$.

In this section we will investigate the depth and the associated prime ideals of this class of ideals and its powers.

Let $\mathbf{x^u} = x_1^{u_1} \cdots x_n^{u_n}$. The support of $\mathbf{u}$, denoted by $\operatorname{supp}(\mathbf{u})$, is the set $\{i|\ u_i \neq 0\}$. If I is a monomial ideal, then the support of I, denoted by $\operatorname{supp}(I)$, is the set $\bigcup_{\mathbf{x^u} \in G(I)} \operatorname{supp}(\mathbf{u})$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $I_1, I_2, \ldots, I_t \subseteq S$ be monomial ideals whose supports are pairwise disjoint. For $j = 1, \ldots, t$, let S_j be a polynomial ring whose set of variables V_j contains the set $\{x_i|\ i \in \operatorname{supp}(I_j)\}$. We further assume that $V_1, \ldots, V_t$ are pairwise disjoint and that $V = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \ldots \cup V_t$ is the set of variables of S. For $j = 1, \ldots, t$, let $J_j = S_j \cap I_j$.*

(a) $\operatorname{depth} S/I_1 \cdots I_t = (\sum_{j=1}^t \operatorname{depth} S_j/J_j) + t - 1$.
(b) $\operatorname{Ass}(S/I_1 \cdots I_t) = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq t} \operatorname{Ass}(S/I_i)$.

Proof. (a) Let J, L be nonzero monomial ideals of S with disjoint supports. Then

$$\operatorname{Tor}_1(S/J, S/L) = \frac{J \cap L}{JL} = 0$$

and so $\operatorname{Tor}_i^S(S/J/, S/L) = 0$ for all $i > 0$ by the rigidity of the functor Tor. This implies that the tensor product of the minimal free resolutions of J and L is the minimal free resolution of JL. In particular, $\operatorname{proj\,dim}_S JL = \operatorname{proj\,dim}_S J + \operatorname{proj\,dim}_S L$. It follows that $\operatorname{proj\,dim}_S I_1 \cdots I_t = \sum_{i=1}^t \operatorname{proj\,dim}_S I_i$ by induction.

By using the Auslander-Buchsbaum formula and since $\operatorname{proj\,dim}_S I_i = \operatorname{proj\,dim}_{S_i} J_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, t$, we have

$$\operatorname{depth} S/I_1 \cdots I_t = |V| - \sum_{i=1}^t \operatorname{proj\,dim} I_i - 1 = (t-1) + \sum_{i=1}^t (|V_i| - \operatorname{proj\,dim}_{S_i} J_i - 1).$$

Since the last term equals to $\sum_{j=1}^t \operatorname{depth} S_j/J_j + t - 1$, our result follows.

(b) Let J, L be as above. From the short exact sequence

$$0 \to S/JL \to S/J \oplus S/L \to S/(J+L) \to 0,$$

we obtain

$$\operatorname{Ass}(S/JL) \subseteq \operatorname{Ass}(S/J) \cup \operatorname{Ass}(S/L) \subseteq \operatorname{Ass}(S/JL) \cup \operatorname{Ass}(S/(J+L)).$$

Since $\operatorname{Ass}(S/(J+L)) = \{P_1 + P_2 \colon\ P_1 \in \operatorname{Ass}(S/J), P_2 \in \operatorname{Ass}(S/L)\}$, it follows that $(\operatorname{Ass}(S/J) \cup \operatorname{Ass}(S/L)) \cap \operatorname{Ass}(S/(J+L)) = \emptyset$. This implies that $\operatorname{Ass}(S/J) \cup \operatorname{Ass}(S/L) = \operatorname{Ass}(S/JL)$. Now (b) follows by the induction on t. □

In the remaining part of this section I always denotes the left PLP-polymatroidal ideal as given in the beginning of this section.

Proposition 5.2. $\operatorname{depth} S/I = |\{k+1 \leq i \leq n-1 \colon\ \alpha_i = \beta_i\}|$.

Proof. Set $t = |\{k+1 \leq i \leq n-1 \colon\ \alpha_i = \beta_i\}|$. Define a vector $\mathbf{v}$ by $v_i = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$, $v_{k+1} = \alpha_{k+1}$, and $v_i = \alpha_i - \alpha_{i-1}$ for $i = k+2, \ldots, n$. Then $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}} \in G(I)$ and $N(\mathbf{v}) = n-1-t$ (see (6) for the definition of $N(\mathbf{u})$). This implies $\operatorname{depth} S/I \leq t$ by Proposition 4.3. Since $N(\mathbf{u}) \leq n-1-t$ for any $\mathbf{u}$ with $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in G(I)$, we have $\operatorname{depth} S/I \geq t$, by using Proposition 4.3 again. □

By definition, $\operatorname{dstab}(I)$ (resp. $\operatorname{astab}(I)$) is the smallest integer k with the property that

$$\operatorname{depth}\ S/I^k = \operatorname{depth}\ S/I^\ell \qquad (\text{resp.} \quad \operatorname{Ass}(S/I^k) = \operatorname{Ass}(S/I^\ell))$$

for all $\ell \geq k$.

Corollary 5.3. $\operatorname{dstab}(I) = 1$.

Proof. The assertion follows from Proposition 5.2 and Proposition 2.9. □

In the rest part of this section, we will determine the associated prime ideals of a left PLP-polymatroidal ideal I.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $P_A \in \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$ and suppose $i \notin A$ for some $i \geq k+1$. Then either $[1, i-1] \cap A = \emptyset$ or $[i+1, n] \cap A = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Assume on the contrary that there exist $1 \leq \ell < i < j \leq n$ such that $\ell \in A$ and $j \in A$. Let $B = [1,n] \setminus \{i\}$. Note that $A \subseteq B$. Let $a_i = \max\{u_i \colon\ \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in G(I)\}$. There are two cases to consider.

The case when $i = k+1$: Since $a_i = a_{k+1} = \beta_{k+1}$ and since $u_1 = \cdots = u_k = 0$ for any $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in G(I)$ with $u_{k+1} = \beta_{k+1}$, we have $\operatorname{supp}(I(B)) \subseteq [k+1, n]$ by Lemma 4.6(b), and in particular, $\operatorname{supp}(I(A)) \subseteq [k+1, n]$. It follows that $\ell \notin \operatorname{supp}(I(A))$, and so $\operatorname{depth} S(A)/I(A) \neq 0$. Hence $P_A \notin \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$, a contradiction.

The case when $i > k+1$: Note that $a_i = \beta_i - \alpha_{i-1}$, and for any $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in G(I)$ with $u_i = a_i$, we have $u_1 + \cdots + u_{i-1} = \alpha_{i-1}$. This implies $I(B) = JL$ by Lemma 4.6(b). Here J is generated by the monomials $x_1^{u_1} \cdots x_{i-1}^{u_{i-1}}$ such that the $u_1, \ldots, u_{i-1}$ satisfy $0 \leq u_1 \leq b_1, \ldots, 0 \leq u_k \leq b_k$, $\alpha_{k+1} \leq u_1 + \cdots + u_{k+1} \leq \beta_{k+1}, \ldots, u_1 + \cdots + u_{i-1} = \alpha_{i-1}$, and L is generated by the monomials $x_{i+1}^{u_{i+1}} \cdots x_n^{u_n}$ such that the $u_{i+1}, \ldots, u_n$ satisfy $\max\{\alpha_{i+1} - \beta_i, 0\} \leq u_{i+1} \leq \beta_{i+1} - \beta_i, \ldots, u_{i+1} + \cdots + u_n = d - \beta_i$. It follows that $I(A) = J(A)L(A)$. Since $\ell \in A$ and $j \in A$, A contains $\operatorname{supp}(L(A))$ and $\operatorname{supp}(J(A))$ properly. By this fact and since $J(A)$ and $L(A)$ have disjoint supports, we have $\operatorname{depth} S(A)/I(A) \neq 0$ by Lemma 5.1(a) and so $P_A \notin \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$, a contradiction again. □

Corollary 5.5. *If $P_A \in \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$, then either A is a subinterval of $[k+2,n]$, or $A = B \cup [k+1,t]$ for some $B \subseteq [1,k]$ and some $t \geq k+1$.*

Proof. Let $P_A \in \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$. In view of Lemma 5.4, we have $A \cap [k+1,n]$ is either empty or an interval. We claim that $A \cap [k+1,n] \neq \emptyset$. For this, let B be a subset of $[1,k]$. As seen in the proof of Lemma 5.4, $\operatorname{supp}(I([1,n] \setminus \{k+1\})) \subseteq [k+2,n]$. It follows that $\operatorname{supp}(I(B)) \subseteq [k+2,n]$, which implies particularly $P_B \notin \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$. This proves the claim.

Let j be the smallest integer in $A \cap [k+1,n]$. If $j \geq k+2$, then $k+1 \notin A$ and it follows that $A \cap [1,k] = \emptyset$ by Lemma 5.4, and so A an interval of $[k+2,n]$. If $j = k+1$, then $A \cap [k+1,n] = [k+1,t]$ for some $t \geq k+1$ and so $A = B \cup [k+1,t]$ and some $B \subseteq [1,k]$. □

Proposition 5.6. *Let $B \subseteq [1,k]$ and $t \in [k+1,n]$. Then $P_{B\cup[k+1,t]} \in \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$ if and only if*

$$\sum_{j\in\overline{B}} b_j < \min\{\alpha_t, \beta_{k+1}\}, \quad \alpha_{t-1} < \alpha_t$$

and

$$\alpha_i < \beta_i, \text{ for all } i = k+1, \ldots, t-1.$$

Here $\overline{B} = [k] \setminus B$ and $\alpha_k = 0$.

Proof. For any $t \geq k+1$, Lemma 4.6(b) implies that $I([1,t])$ is an ideal in $S([1,t])$ generated by $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying $0 \leq u_i \leq b_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$ and $\alpha_i \leq u_1 + \cdots + u_i \leq \min\{\alpha_t, \beta_i\}$ for $i = k+1, \ldots, t$. Let $B \subseteq [1,k]$. We claim that if $\sum_{j\in\overline{B}} b_j \geq \min\{\alpha_t, \beta_{k+1}\}$, then $P_{B\cup[k+1,t]} \notin \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$. (Note that the latter is equivalent to the condition that $\operatorname{depth} S([1,t] \setminus \overline{B})/I([1,t] \setminus \overline{B}) \neq 0$). For this, we use induction on $|\overline{B}|$.

If $|\overline{B}| = 1$, say $\overline{B} = \{i_1\}$, then, since $\max\{u_{i_1} : \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in I([1,t])\} = \min\{\alpha_t, \beta_{k+1}\}$, we have $k+1 \notin \operatorname{supp}(I(B \cup [k+1,t]))$ by Lemma 4.6(b). In particular, $P_{B\cup[k+1,t]} \notin \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$.

Suppose that $|\overline{B}| > 1$. We assume there exists $i_1 \in \overline{B}$ such that $b_{i_1} < \min\{\alpha_t, \beta_{k+1}\}$, because otherwise we can argue as in the proceeding paragraph and obtain that $P_{B\cup[k+1,t]} \notin \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$. Then $I([1,t] \setminus \{i_1\})$ is an ideal in $S([1,t] \setminus \{i_1\})$ generated by $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying $0 \leq u_i \leq b_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ with $i \neq i_1$, and $\max\{\alpha_i - b_{i_1}, 0\} \leq u_1 + \cdots + u_i \leq \min\{\alpha_t, \beta_i\} - b_{i_1}$ for $i = k+1, \ldots, t$. Let $T = [1,t] \setminus \{i_1\}$ and $C = B \cup \{i_1\}$. Note that $|\overline{C}| < |\overline{B}|$, where $\overline{C} = [k] \setminus C$. By induction hypothesis,

$$\operatorname{depth}\, S([1,t] \setminus \overline{B})/I([1,t] \setminus \overline{B}) = \operatorname{depth}\, S(T \setminus \overline{C})/I(T \setminus \overline{C}) \neq 0,$$

that is, $P_{B\cup[k+1,t]} \notin \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$. This completes the proof of our claim.

Now assume $\sum_{j\in\overline{B}} b_j < \min\{\alpha_t, \beta_{k+1}\}$. Then $I(B \cup [k+1,t])$ is an ideal in $S(B \cup [k+1,t])$ generated by $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying $0 \leq u_i \leq b_i$ for each $i \in B$ and

$$\max\{\alpha_i - \sum_{j\in\overline{B}} b_j, 0\} \leq \sum_{j\in B} u_j + u_{k+1} + \cdots + u_i \leq \min\{\alpha_t, \beta_i\} - \sum_{j\in\overline{B}} b_j$$

for $i = k+1, \ldots, t$.

In view of Proposition 5.2, we see that depth $S(B\cup[k+1,t])/I(B\cup[k+1,t]) = 0$ if and only if $\alpha_i < \min\{\alpha_t, \beta_i\}$ for $i = k+1, \ldots, t-1$. This is the case if and only if $\alpha_i < \beta_i$ for $i = k+1, \ldots, t-1$ and $\alpha_{t-1} < \alpha_t$, as required. □

Proposition 5.7. *For any interval $[s,t] \subseteq [k+2,n]$, we have $P_{[s,t]} \in \mathrm{Ass}(S/I)$ if and only if $\alpha_i < \beta_i$ for $i = s, \cdots, t-1$, $\beta_{s-1} < \beta_s$, $\alpha_{t-1} < \alpha_t$ and $\beta_{s-1} < \alpha_t$.*

Proof. Note that $I([1,n]\setminus\{k+1\})$ is an ideal in $S([1,n]\setminus\{k+1\})$ generated by $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying $u_i = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$, and

$$\max\{\alpha_i - \beta_{k+1}, 0\} \le u_{k+2} + \cdots + u_i \le \beta_i - \beta_{k+1} \quad \text{for} \quad i = k+2, \ldots, n. \tag{7}$$

Hence $I([k+2,n])$ is an ideal in $S([k+2,n])$ generated by $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying the inequalities in (7). Applying Proposition 4.7 to this case, the result follows. □

Combining last three results, we obtain:

Theorem 5.8. *$P_A \in \mathrm{Ass}(S/I)$ if and only if either*

(a) *$A = B \cup [k+1,t]$, where $B \subseteq [1,k], t \ge k+1$ and*

$$\sum_{j\in[k]\setminus B} b_j < \min\{\alpha_t, \beta_{k+1}\}, \quad \alpha_{t-1} < \alpha_t, \quad \alpha_i < \beta_i \text{ for all } i = k+1, \ldots, t-1,$$

or

(b) *$A = [s,t]$, where $k+2 \le s \le t \le n$ and*

$$\beta_{s-1} < \beta_s, \quad \alpha_{t-1} < \alpha_t, \quad \beta_{s-1} < \alpha_t, \quad \alpha_i < \beta_i \text{ for all } i = s, \ldots, t-1.$$

As a consequence we obtain

Corollary 5.9. $\mathrm{astab}(I) = 1$.

Proof. The assertion follows from Theorem 5.8 together with Proposition 2.9. □

Combining Corollary 5.9 with Corollary 5.3, we obtain:

Corollary 5.10. *Let I be a left PLP-polymatroidal ideal. Then* $\mathrm{dstab}(I) = \mathrm{astab}(I) = 1$.

It was proved in [8] that every polymatroidal ideal is of *strong intersection type*, that is, if I is a polymatroidal ideal, then $\bigcap_{P\in\mathrm{Ass}(S/I)} P^{d_P}$ is an irredundant primary decomposition of I, where d_P is the degree of generators in $I(P)$. From the proofs of Propositions 5.6 and 5.7, we see that if $P_{B\cup[k+1,t]} \in \mathrm{Ass}(S/I)$ then $d_{P_{B\cup[k+1,t]}} = \alpha_t - \sum_{j\in\overline{B}} b_j$, and if $P_{[s,t]} \in \mathrm{Ass}(S/I)$ then $d_{P_{[s,t]}} = \alpha_t - \beta_{s-1}$.

Example 5.11. Let I be an ideal generated by $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}$ such that $\mathbf{u}$ satisfies $0 \le u_i \le 2$ for $i = 1, 2$, $0 \le u_3 \le 3$, $2 \le \sum_{i=1}^4 u_i \le 4$ and $\sum_{i=1}^5 u_i = 5$. Then $I = P^5_{[1,5]} \cap P^2_{[1,4]} \cap P^2_{[1,5]\setminus\{3\}} \cap P^3_{[2,5]} \cap P^3_{[1,5]\setminus\{2\}} \cap P_5$. Here $P_5 = (x_5)$.

6. The depth and the associated prime ideals of right PLP-polymatroidal ideals

In this section we will investigate another class of PLP-polymatroidal ideals, which we call *right PLP-polymatroidal ideals*. A PLP-polymatroidal ideal of type $(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{b}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is called a right PLP-polymatroidal ideal, if there exists $k \in [1, n-1]$ such that $b_i \geq d$ for all $i \leq k$, and $\alpha_i = \alpha_k$ and $\beta_i = d$ for all $k+1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Hence a right PLP-polymatroidal ideal is an ideal I in $S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ generated by the monomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}}$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying

$$\alpha_i \leq u_1 + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i, \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, k,$$

$$0 \leq u_i \leq b_i, \text{ for } i = k+1, \ldots, n,$$

and

$$u_1 + \cdots + u_n = d.$$

Here $\alpha_1 \leq \cdots \leq \alpha_k \leq d$, $0 < \beta_1 \leq \cdots \leq \beta_k \leq d$, $\alpha_i \leq \beta_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$ and $b_i > 0$ for $i = k+1, \ldots, n$. To ensure that $I \neq 0$ we always assume that $d \leq \beta_k + b_{k+1} + \cdots + b_n$. Note that if $k = 1$ then I is of Veronese type.

In this section, the ideal I always denotes the right PLP-polymatroidal ideal as given above and we will determine the depth and the associated prime ideals of this class of ideals and its powers. First we characterize the ideal I with $\operatorname{depth} S/I = 0$. For convenience we set $\mathbf{b}(B) = \sum_{i \in B} b_i$ for $B \subseteq [k+1, n]$

Lemma 6.1. $\operatorname{depth} S/I = 0$ *if and only if* $d \leq \beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1, n]) - n + k$ *and* $\alpha_i < \beta_i$ *for* $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

Proof. Suppose that $\operatorname{depth} S/I = 0$. Then, by Proposition 4.3, there is $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in G(I)$ such that $N(\mathbf{u}) = n-1$ (see (6) for the definition of $N(\mathbf{u})$). This implies that $u_1 + \cdots + u_k \leq \beta_k - 1$ and $u_i \leq b_i - 1$ for $i = k+1, \ldots, n-1$. Therefore we have $d = u_1 + \cdots + u_n \leq \beta_k - 1 + b_{k+1} - 1 + \cdots + b_{n-1} - 1 + b_n = \beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1, n]) - n + k$. Since $u_1 + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i - 1$, we have $\alpha_i < \beta_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

Conversely, since $0 < d - \beta_k + 1 \leq (b_{k+1} - 1) + \cdots + (b_{n-1} - 1) + b_n$, there exist integers $c_{k+1}, \ldots, c_n$ such that $c_{k+1} + \cdots + c_n = d - \beta_k + 1$, $0 \leq c_i \leq b_i - 1$ for $i = k+1, \ldots, n-1$ and $c_n \leq b_n$. Let $\mathbf{u} = (\beta_1 - 1, \beta_2 - \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k - \beta_{k-1}, c_{k+1}, \ldots, c_n)$. Then $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in G(I)$ and $N(\mathbf{u}) = n-1$, which implies $\operatorname{depth} S/I = 0$. □

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose that* $\alpha_i < \beta_i$ *for* $i = 1, \ldots, k$. *Then*

$$\operatorname{depth} S/I = \max\{0, d - \beta_k - \mathbf{b}([k+1, n]) + n - k\}.$$

Proof. Let $t = d - \beta_k - \mathbf{b}([k+1, n]) + n - k$. The case when $t \leq 0$ follows from Lemma 6.1. Assume that $t > 0$. Then we set $j = n - 1 - t$. Note that $j \geq k-1$, since $d \leq \beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1, n])$. There are several cases to consider.

If $j = k-1$, we let $\mathbf{u} = (\beta_1 - 1, \beta_2 - \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k - \beta_{k-1} + 1, b_{k+1}, \ldots, b_n)$. Then $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in G(I)$ and $N(\mathbf{u}) = k-1$. It follows that $\operatorname{depth} S/I \leq n - k = t$, see Proposition 4.3.

If $j = k$, we let $\mathbf{u} = (\beta_1 - 1, \beta_2 - \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k - \beta_{k-1}, b_{k+1}, \ldots, b_n)$. Then $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in G(I)$ and $N(\mathbf{u}) = k$. It follows that $\operatorname{depth} S/I \leq n - k - 1 = t$ by Proposition 4.3 again.

If $j \geq k+1$, we let $\mathbf{u} = (\beta_1 - 1, \beta_2 - \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k - \beta_{k-1}, b_{k+1} - 1, \ldots, b_j - 1, b_{j+1}, \ldots, b_n)$. Then $\mathbf{u} \in G(I)$ and $N(\mathbf{u}) = j$. Hence $\operatorname{depth} S/I \leq n - 1 - j = t$.

It remains to be shown that $N(\mathbf{u}) \leq j$ if $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in G(I)$. Fix $\mathbf{u}$ with $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in G(I)$. We set

$$j_1 = |\{i\colon\ u_1 + \cdots + u_i < \beta_i, 1 \leq i \leq k\}|$$

and

$$j_2 = |\{i\colon\ u_i < b_i, k+1 \leq i \leq n-1\}|.$$

Then $N(\mathbf{u}) = j_1 + j_2$. If $j_1 = k$, then $u_1 + \cdots + u_k \leq \beta_k - 1$ and so $u_{k+1} + \cdots + u_n \geq d - \beta_k + 1$. On the other hand, $u_{k+1} + \cdots + u_n \leq \mathbf{b}([k+1, n]) - j_2$. This implies that $d - \beta_k + 1 \leq \mathbf{b}([k+1, n]) - j_2$, and so $j \leq n - k - t - 1$. Therefore we have $N(\mathbf{u}) = k + j_2 \leq n - 1 - t = j$.

If $j_1 < k$, then $d = u_1 + \cdots + u_n \leq \beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1, n]) - j_2$, and so $N(\mathbf{u}) \leq j_2 + k - 1 \leq n - 1 - t = j$. This completes the proof. □

Discussion 6.3. We now consider the general case in which we do not require the strict inequalities $\alpha_i < \beta_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. For this, let $i_1 < \cdots < i_s$ be such that $\{1 \leq i \leq k\colon\ \alpha_i = \beta_i\} = \{i_1, \ldots, i_s\}$. We then observe that I can be write as the product of ideals $I_1, \ldots, I_s$ and J which are given as follows. The ideal I_1 is generated by $x_1^{u_1} \cdots x_{i_1}^{u_{i_1}}$ with $u_1, \ldots, u_{i_1}$ satisfying $\alpha_i \leq u_1 + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, i_1$. For $1 \leq t \leq s-1$, the ideal I_{t+1} is generated by $x_{i_t+1}^{u_{i_t+1}} \cdots x_{i_{(t+1)}}^{u_{i_{(t+1)}}}$ with $u_{i_t+1}, \ldots, u_{i_{(t+1)}}$ satisfying $\max\{\alpha_i - \beta_{i_t}, 0\} \leq u_{i_t+1} + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i - \beta_{i_t}$ for $i = i_t + 1, \ldots, i_{(t+1)}$.

If $i_s = k$, that is, if $\alpha_k = \beta_k$, then the ideal J is generated by $x_{k+1}^{u_{k+1}} \cdots x_n^{u_n}$ with $u_{k+1}, \ldots, u_n$ satisfying $0 \leq u_{k+1} \leq b_{k+1}, \ldots, 0 \leq u_n \leq b_n, u_{k+1} + \cdots + u_n = d - \beta_k$. In this case J is of Veronese type.

If $i_s < k$, that is, if $\alpha_k \neq \beta_k$, then the ideal J is generated by $x_{i_s+1}^{u_{i_s+1}} \cdots x_n^{u_n}$ with $u_{i_s+1}, \ldots, u_n$ satisfying

$$\max\{\alpha_i - \beta_{i_s}, 0\} \leq u_{i_s+1} + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i - \beta_{i_s} \text{ for } i = i_s + 1, \ldots, k,$$

$$0 \leq u_{k+1} \leq b_{k+1}, \ldots, 0 \leq u_n \leq b_n,$$

and

$$u_{i_s+1} + \ldots + u_{k+1} + \cdots + u_n = d - \beta_{i_s}.$$

Note that these ideals $I_1, \ldots, I_s, J$ have pairwise disjoint supports.

Moreover if we let S_t be the polynomial ring in variables x_i with $i \in \operatorname{supp}(I_t)$ for $1 \leq t \leq s$, then $\operatorname{depth} S_t/(I_t \cap S_t) = 0$ by Proposition 4.4. ♢

Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. We denote by $\lfloor a \rfloor$ the lower integer part and by $\lceil a \rceil$ the upper integer part of a.

Theorem 6.4. *Let $s = |\{i\colon\ \alpha_i = \beta_i, 1 \leq i \leq k\}|$. Then*

$$\operatorname{depth} S/I = s + \max\{0, d - \beta_k - \mathbf{b}([k+1, n]) + n - k - \lfloor \frac{\alpha_k}{\beta_k} \rfloor\}.$$

Proof. Let $R = K[x_{i_s+1}, \ldots, x_n]$. By Discussion 6.3 and Lemma 5.1(a), we have $\operatorname{depth} S/I = s + \operatorname{depth} R/R \cap J$. If $\alpha_k = \beta_k$, then $\operatorname{depth} R/R \cap J = \max\{0, d - \beta_k - \mathbf{b}([k+1,n]) + n - k - 1\}$ by Lemma 6.2 (or by [7, Corollary 4.7]). If $\alpha_k < \beta_k$, then $\operatorname{depth} R/R \cap J = \max\{0, d - \beta_k - \mathbf{b}([k+1,n]) + n - k\}$ by Lemma 6.2. Hence our formula for the depth follows. □

Corollary 6.5. (a) *If* $d = \beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1,n])$, *then* $\operatorname{dstab}(I) = 1$.
(b) *Set* $\delta = \lfloor \frac{\alpha_k}{\beta_k} \rfloor$. *If* $d < \beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1,n])$, *then* $\operatorname{dstab}(I) = \lceil \frac{n-k-\delta}{\beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1,n]) - d} \rceil$.

Proof. (a) If $d = \beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1,n])$, then $I = x_{k+1}^{b_{k+1}} \cdots x_n^{b_n} L$, where L is generated by $x_1^{u_1} \cdots x_k^{u_k}$ such that $\alpha_i \le u_1 + \cdots + u_i \le \beta_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$ and $u_1 + \cdots + u_k = \beta_k$. Let $S_1 = K[x_1, \ldots, x_k]$ and $S_2 = K[x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_n]$. By Lemme 5.1 and since $\operatorname{depth} S_2/(x_{k+1}^{b_{k+1}} \cdots x_n^{b_n})^m = n - k - 1$ for all integer $m > 0$, we have

$$\operatorname{depth} S/I^m = \operatorname{depth} S_1/(S_1 \cap L)^m + n - k.$$

Note that $S_1 \cap L$ is a lattice path polymatroidal ideal. Therefore, by Proposition 4.7, we have $\operatorname{dstab}(S_1 \cap L) = 1$, and so $\operatorname{dstab}(I) = 1$.

(b) If $d < \beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1,n])$, then $\operatorname{depth} S/I^m = s$ for all $m \gg 0$, by Theorem 6.4. It follows that $\operatorname{dstab}(I)$ is the smallest integer i such that $i(d - \beta_k - \mathbf{b}([k+1,n])) + n - k - \delta \le 0$, which certainly is $\lceil \frac{n-k-\delta}{\beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1,n]) - d} \rceil$. □

Next we will determine $\operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$. First, by using a similar argument as in Lemma 5.4 one obtain:

Lemma 6.6. *Let* $P_A \in \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$. *If there is* $1 \le i \le k$ *such that* $i \notin A$, *then either* $A \cap [1, i-1] = \emptyset$ *or* $A \cap [i+1, n] = \emptyset$.

As an immediate consequence we obtain

Corollary 6.7. *Let* $P_A \in \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$. *Then* A *is an interval contained in* $[1,k]$, *or* A *is a subset of* $[k+1,n]$, *or* $A = [s,k] \cup B$ *for some* $s \le k$ *and some subset* B *of* $[k+1,n]$.

Proposition 6.8. *Set* $\beta_0 = 0$. *Suppose that* $\alpha_i < \beta_i$ *for* $i = 1, \ldots, k$. *Given* $1 \le s \le t \le k$ *and a subset* B *of* $[k+1,n]$, *we have*

(a) *The following statements are equivalent:*
  (1) $P_{[s,t]} \in \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$.
  (2) $\alpha_k \le d - \mathbf{b}([k+1,n]) \le \beta_k$ *and* $(\beta_{s-1} - \alpha_t)(\beta_{s-1} - \beta_s)(\alpha_{t-1} - \alpha_t) < 0$.

(b) *The following statements are equivalent:*
  (1) $P_B \in \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$.
  (2) $\mathbf{b}([k+1,n] \setminus B) + \beta_k < d \le \beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1,n]) - |B|$.

(c) *The following statements are equivalent:*
  (1) $P_{[s,k]\cup B} \in \operatorname{Ass}(S/I)$.
  (2) $\mathbf{b}([k+1,n] \setminus B) + \max\{\beta_{s-1}, \alpha_k\} < d \le \beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1,n]) - |B|$ *and* $\beta_{s-1} < \beta_s$.

Moreover, $\mathrm{Ass}(S/I)$ *consists exactly of these monomial prime ideals which satisfy one of the conditions described in* (a), (b) *and* (c).

Proof. (a) Note that $I([1,k])$ is generated by monomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in S([1,k])$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying $\alpha_1 \leq u_1 \leq \beta_1, \ldots, \alpha_k \leq u_1 + \cdots + u_k \leq \beta_k$, and $u_1 + \cdots + u_k = d - \mathbf{b}([k+1,n])$. Hence $I([1,k]) \neq 0$ if and only if $\alpha_k \leq d - \mathbf{b}([k+1,n]) \leq \beta_k$. If this is the case, then $I([1,k])$ is the LP-polymatroidal ideal generated by monomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in S([1,k])$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying

$$\alpha_i \leq u_1 + \cdots + u_i \leq \min\{d - \mathbf{b}([k+1,n]), \beta_i\}$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$, and

$$u_1 + \cdots + u_k = d - \mathbf{b}([k+1,n]).$$

Set $d_1 = d - \mathbf{b}([k+1,n]$ and apply Proposition 4.7 to this case, we see that $P_{[s,t]} \in \mathrm{Ass}(S/I)$ if and only if $\alpha_k \leq d_1 \leq \beta_k$, $\alpha_{t-1} < \alpha_t$, $\min\{d_1, \beta_{s-1}\} < \alpha_t$, $\min\{d_1, \beta_{s-1}\} < \min\{d_1, \beta_s\}$ and $\alpha_i < \min\{d_1, \beta_i\}$ for $i = s, \ldots, t-1$, which is equivalent to $\alpha_k \leq d_1 \leq \beta_k$, $\beta_{s-1} < \beta_s$, $\beta_{s-1} < \alpha_t$ and $\alpha_{t-1} < \alpha_t$, since $\alpha_t \leq \alpha_k$. Now our result follows.

(b) By using Proposition 4.6(b) repeatedly, we have $I([k+1,n])$ is generated by monomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in S([k+1,n])$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying $0 \leq u_i \leq b_i$ for $i = k+1, \ldots, n$ and $u_{k+1} + \cdots + u_n = d - \beta_k$. In a similar way as in Proposition 5.6, we see that if $d - \beta_k - \mathbf{b}([k+1,n] \setminus B) \leq 0$ then $P_B \notin \mathrm{Ass}(S/I)$, moreover if $d - \beta_k - \mathbf{b}([k+1,n] \setminus B) > 0$, then $I(B)$ is generated by monomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in S(B)$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying

$$0 \leq u_i \leq b_i, \text{ for all } i \in B \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in B} u_i = d - \beta_k - \mathbf{b}([k+1,n] \setminus B).$$

Applying Lemma 6.1 and Proposition 4.4(a), the result follows.

(c) Note that $I([s,k] \cup B)$ is generated by monomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in S([s,k] \cup B)$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying

$$\max\{\alpha_i - \beta_{s-1}, 0\} \leq u_s + \cdots + u_i \leq \beta_i - \beta_{s-1} \quad \text{for } i = s, \ldots, k$$

$$0 \leq u_i \leq b_i \text{ for } i \in B \quad \text{and} \quad u_s + \cdots + u_k + \sum_{i \in B} u_i = d - \beta_{s-1} - \mathbf{b}([k+1,n] \setminus B).$$

Hence $I([s,k] \cup B) \neq (0)$ if and only if $d - \beta_{s-1} - \mathbf{b}([k+1,n] \setminus B) > \max\{0, \alpha_k - \beta_{s-1}\}$. If this is the case, we let $\hat{d} = d - \beta_{s-1} - \mathbf{b}([k+1,n] \setminus B)$. We describe $I([s,k] \cup B)$ in the form as given in the beginning of this section: $I([s,k] \cup B)$ is generated by monomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{u}} \in S([s,k] \cup B)$ with $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying

$$\max\{\alpha_i - \beta_{s-1}, 0\} \leq u_s + \cdots + u_i \leq \min\{\hat{d}, \beta_i - \beta_{s-1}\} \quad \text{for } i = s, \ldots, k$$

$$0 \leq u_i \leq b_i \text{ for } i \in B \quad \text{and} \quad u_s + \cdots + u_k + \sum_{i \in B} u_i = \hat{d}.$$

Note that $\max\{\alpha_i - \beta_{s-1}, 0\} < \min\{\hat{d}, \beta_i - \beta_{s-1}\}$ for $i = s, \ldots, k$ if and only if $\beta_{s-1} < \beta_s$. By Lemma 6.1 and Proposition 4.4(a), we have $P_{[s,k] \cup B} \in \mathrm{Ass}(S/I)$ if and only if $\beta_{s-1} < \beta_s$ and $\hat{d} \leq \min\{\hat{d}, \beta_k - \beta_{s-1}\} + \mathbf{b}(B) - |B|$. One can check the last inequality is equivalent to $d \leq \beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1,n]) - |B|$, as required.

Finally the last statement follows from Corollary 6.7. □

By definition, $\mathrm{Ass}^\infty(S/I)$ consists of prime ideals P for which $P \in \mathrm{Ass}(S/I^m)$ for all $m \gg 0$.

Proposition 6.9. *Suppose $\alpha_i < \beta_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$ and $d < \beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1, n])$. Given $1 \le s \le t \le k$ and a subset B of $[k+1, n]$, we have*

(a) $P_{[s,t]} \in \mathrm{Ass}^\infty(S/I) \iff P_{[s,t]} \in \mathrm{Ass}(S/I)$.

(b) $P_B \in \mathrm{Ass}^\infty(S/I) \iff \mathbf{b}([k+1, n] \setminus B) + \beta_k < d$.

(c) $P_{[s,k]\cup B} \in \mathrm{Ass}^\infty(S/I) \iff \mathbf{b}([k+1, n]\setminus B) + \max\{\beta_{s-1}, \alpha_k\} < d$ *and* $\beta_{s-1} < \beta_s$.

Moreover, $\mathrm{Ass}^\infty(S/I)$ *consists exactly of these monomial prime ideals which satisfy one of the conditions described in* (a), (b) *and* (c).

Proof. By the assumption that $d < \beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1, n])$, we have $md \le m\beta_k + m\mathbf{b}([k+1, n]) - |B|$ for all $m \gg 0$. By this fact and in view of Propositions 6.8 and 2.9, the assertions (a), (b) and (c) follow. Finally the last statement follows from the last one of Proposition 6.8. □

Corollary 6.10. *Suppose that $\alpha_i < \beta_i$ for $i = 1, \cdots, k$ and $d < \beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1, n])$. Then*

$$\mathrm{astab}(I) = \lceil \frac{n-k}{\beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1, n]) - d} \rceil.$$

Proof. Set $\Delta = \lceil \frac{n-k}{\beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1,n]) - d} \rceil$. In view of Proposition 6.9(c), we have $P_{[n]} = P_{[k]\cup[k+1,n]} \in \mathrm{Ass}^\infty(S/I)$, since $\beta_0 = 0 < \beta_1$. Moreover, $P_{[n]} \in \mathrm{Ass}(S/I^m)$ if and only if $m \ge \Delta$ by Proposition 6.8(c) and Proposition 2.9. This implies $\mathrm{astab}(I) \ge \Delta$.

It remains to be shown that $P \in \mathrm{Ass}(S/I^m)$ for any $m \ge \Delta$ and for any $P \in \mathrm{Ass}^\infty(S/I)$. But this is clear by checking it for three classes of ideals in $\mathrm{Ass}^\infty(S/I)$ given in Proposition 6.9 respectively. □

We remark that if $k = 1$, then Corollary 6.10 is equivalent to [7, Corollary 4.6]. In the proof of the following result we will use the following fact: if I is a monomial ideal in $S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, then $\mathrm{Ass}(T/IT) = \{PT\colon\ P \in \mathrm{Ass}(S/I)\}$ for any polynomial ring $T = K[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$ with $m \ge n$. As before we set $\delta = \lfloor \frac{\alpha_k}{\beta_k} \rfloor$.

Theorem 6.11. (a) *If $d = \beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1, n])$, then* $\mathrm{astab}(I) = 1$.

(b) *If $d < \beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1, n])$, then* $\mathrm{astab}(I) = \lceil \frac{n-k-\delta}{\beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1,n]) - d} \rceil$.

Proof. (a) As in the proof of Theorem 6.4, $I = x_{k+1}^{b_{k+1}} \cdots x_n^{b_n} J$, where J is a lattice path polymatroidal ideal. By Proposition 4.7, we have $\mathrm{astab}(J) = 1$ and so $\mathrm{astab}(I) = 1$.

(b) Let $I_1, \ldots, I_s, J$ and $S_1, \ldots, S_s, R$ be as in Discussion 6.3. Since $S_i \cap I_i$ is a lattice path polymatroidal ideal, we have $\mathrm{astab}(S_i \cap I_i) = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, s$. It follows that $\mathrm{astab}(I) = \mathrm{astab}(J \cap R)$ by Lemma 5.1(b). There are two cases to consider.

In the case when $\alpha_k = \beta_k$ we have $\mathrm{astab}(R \cap J) = \lceil \frac{n-k-1}{\beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1,n]) - d} \rceil$ by [7, Corollary 4.6], and in the case when $\alpha_k < \beta_k$ we have $\mathrm{astab}(R \cap J) = \lceil \frac{n-k}{\beta_k + \mathbf{b}([k+1,n]) - d} \rceil$ by Corollary 6.10. This yields the desired formula. □

We conclude this section by the following result.

Corollary 6.12. *Let I be a right PLP-polymatroidal ideal. Then* $\operatorname{astab}(I) = \operatorname{dstab}(I)$.

Proof. It follows from Theorem 6.11 as well as Corollary 6.5. □

References

[1] E. De Negri and T. Hibi, *Gorenstein algebras of Veronese type,* J. Algebra **193** (1997) 629–639.

[2] J. Edmonds, *Submodular functions, matroids, and certain polyhedra*, in Combinatorial Structures and Their Applications, R. Guy, H. Hanani, N. Sauer, and J. Schonheim (Eds.), Gordon and Breach, New York, 1970, 69–87.

[3] C. Francisco, H. Tai Ha, A. Van Tuyl, *Coloring of hypergraphs, perfect graphs and associated primes of powers of monomial ideals*, J. Algebra **331** (2011), 224–242.

[4] J. Herzog, T. Hibi, *Discrete Polymatroids*, Journal Algebraic Combinatorics **16** (2002) 239–268.

[5] J. Herzog, and T. Hibi, *Monomial Ideals*, Graduate Text in Mathematics, Springer, 2011

[6] J. Herzog, T. Hibi, T., M. Vladoiu, *Ideals of fiber type and polymatroid*, Osaka J. Math. **42** (2005) 807–829.

[7] J. Herzog, A. Rauf, M. Vladoiu, *The stable set of a associated prime ideals of a polymatroidal ideal*, J. Algebraic Combinatorics **37** (2013) 289–312.

[8] J. Herzog, M. Vladoiu, *Monomial ideals with primary components given by powers of monomial prime ideals*, Electronical Journal Combinatorials **21** (2014) #P1.69.

[9] J. Oxley, *Matroid Theory*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1992.

[10] J. Schweig, *Toric ideals of lattice path matroids and polymatroids*, J. Pure and Applied Algebra, **215** (2011) 2660–2665.

[11] J. Schweig, *On the h-Vector of a Lattice Path Matroid*, Electronic Journal Combinatorics **17** (2010) #N.3.

[12] B. Sturmfels, *Gröbner Bases and Convex Polytopes*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1995.

[13] N. White, *A unique exchange property for bases*, Linear Algebra Appl. **31** (1980) 81–91.

Dancheng Lu, Department of Mathematics, Soochow University, P.R.China
E-mail address: ludancheng@suda.edu.cn